

Class

270D

Book

14781

General Theological Seminary Library

Chelsea Square, New York

cop. 2

PRESENTED BY

Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

By the same Author.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, For Schools and Families. Crown 8vo., cloth, price 5s.

Opinions of the Press on the First Edition.

The *Times* of April 23, 1891:—"It is written, suitably to its purpose, in a simple, direct, and interesting style. We need not say that 'Anglican' views of the traditions and position of the Church are given full expression."

The *Standard* of Oct. 17, 1891:—Mr. Hore never seeks to conceal the fact that he is a devoted son of the Anglican Church; but he is studiously fair to the Roman Catholics on one side and the Nonconformists on the other, and never overstates his case against either."

The *Globe* of April 20, 1891:—"This tells the Story of the Church more completely and yet more tersely than any other volume with which we are acquainted. Here may be found all that is necessary to an intelligent understanding of the past and present of the great institution with which the Author has to do. Mr. Hore begins at the beginning—with the Celtic forerunners of the Church—and brings his narrative down to the publication of 'Lux Mundi.'"

The *Morning Post* of June 22, 1891:—"To compress the story of the English Church into 500 pages, and to give a full description of its growth and progress, without making the record a mere string of dates and names devoid of interest or life, is no easy task. Mr. Hore, however, has achieved it triumphantly, and his thoughtful work will rank for thoroughness of treatment and attractiveness of style with Mr. Green's 'Short History.'"

The *Saturday Review* of May 30, 1891:—"There is no surer safeguard against schism than is derived from an acquaintance with the character and historical basis of the claims which the Church makes upon the loyalty of its members, and we therefore welcome the Rev. A. H. Hore's book as a means of spreading much sound information about the Church's history. While writing specially for young people, he has wisely refrained from adopting a different style of treatment from that which would be equally appropriate in a book for more advanced students."

The *Athenæum* of July 25, 1891:—"As far as England is concerned it is most comprehensive, even such recent events being included as the publication of 'Lux Mundi,' and the judgment in the case of Read and others *v.* the Bishop of Lincoln. Mr. Hore writes from the very intelligible standpoint that the Reformation did not create a new Church but eradicated abuses."

The *Guardian* of July 29, 1891:—"It seems to us an excellent work of its kind. Mr. Hore writes from the point of view of one who believes that the Church of England of the nineteenth century is identical with the Apostolic Church and the Church of St. Augustine, and rightly traces out its continuous history through all the perils and dangers that have beset it. He brings the tale down to the publication of 'Lux Mundi' in 1889, and the Archbishop's judgment in the Lincoln case, 1890. . . . We can say with some confidence that this is the best short *Church* history of the Church of England with which we are acquainted."

The *Record* of June 26, 1891:—"We congratulate Mr. Hore on having supplied in his History of the Church of England the very pressing want of a Short History of the English Church in quite as satisfactory a way as we could expect a High Churchman to supply it. . . . He evidently studies to be fair, and recognises the immense good done by the Evangelicals. . . . Mr. Hore's book is distinctly good. He means it, as he tells us, for schools and families. . . . But it is itself worthy of the attention of 'more advanced students,' and we expect it will be read chiefly by these. For there are many University men to whom the 'Outlines of English Church History' demanded of them by their examiners form the chief bugbear in their final examination; men who shrink from 'Perry' and find 'Cutts' insufficient. To such as these we unhesitatingly suggest Mr. Hore's volume. They will certainly find it the best for their purpose, for it is full enough, it is clear, it is, generally speaking, sound in judgment and trustworthy in details."

The *Church Times* of August 21, 1891: "The Text is as readable as history written truthfully can be. . . . Controversial matters are treated with scrupulous fairness, and in a right spirit; . . . there is a surprising amount of information packed into this single volume of 500 pages. . . . The remark often made, we fear with some reason, that members of the English Church are unable to give a reason for their Churchmanship, will be rendered impossible if clergy and men of influence will do their best to get this volume into wide circulation; . . . all who ask us to recommend a good popular Church History, should make a note of Mr. Hore's work. . . . The Author has most ably proved the continuity of the English Church from the time of St. Augustine, and in a long series of events from 597 to 1890, has omitted nothing of vital importance."

The *Church Review* of July 30, 1891:—"The matter is well-arranged; the style clear and simple. . . . The author has worked out his theme with learning, skill, and commendable impartiality. He does not shrink from exposing the dark as well as the brighter side of his country's and Church's History."

HISTORY
OF THE
CHURCH CATHOLIC.

HISTORY

OF THE

CHURCH CATHOLIC.

BY

THE REV. A. H. HORE, M.A.,

OF TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD;

AUTHOR OF "HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND," ETC.

James Parker and Co.,

6 SOUTHAMPTON-STREET, STRAND, LONDON;

AND 27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD.

1895.

270D

H 781

cop. 2

64339

NEW YORK
PUBLIC
LIBRARY

PRINTED BY JAMES PARKER AND CO.,
CROWN YARD, OXFORD.

P R E F A C E.

THE present work is a further contribution to those already existing, in the cause of Church Defence.

That an extraordinary ignorance of Church history prevails, is evident from the recent agitation against the Church in Wales. That Church is part, and the oldest part, of the Church of England; and until Englishmen and Welshmen will learn to understand what the history and claims of their Church are, its position will not cease to be assailed.

The late Prime Minister put forward unhistorical statements with respect to the Church, which, if he spoke seriously, betrayed an ignorance of history which would disgrace a schoolboy, and which his own Home Secretary had to correct. Nothing in history is more certain than the continuity, in doctrine and discipline, of the present Church of England, with the primitive Catholic Church, as it existed in this land long before the coming of St. Augustine. Driven out by our English forefathers it took refuge for a time in Wales. Then came St. Augustine, who was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, not in Rome but, by an Archbishop of the Gallican Church.

Since that time there has never been a break in its continuity. If Churchmen will refer to the Preface in their Prayer-Book, they will learn that no new services were introduced at the Reformation; the old Service-books were simply remodelled, and the services, which were before read in Latin, have since then been read in English. If they will study Church History, they will learn that the Archbishops of Canterbury, from Cranmer, and Pole, and Parker, down to Archbishop Benson, are equally

the successors of St. Augustine, as were Theodore, and SS. Anselm and Becket, and Warham.

A continuous History of the Catholic Church, comprised in one volume, is, it need scarcely be said, of an elementary character, intended for beginners; the present work is an attempt to give *some* knowledge on the subject, leaving it to others to give *more*. There is at present, and probably will be for some years, a lull in the ecclesiastical storm which so lately threatened to overwhelm the Catholic Church in this land. The attack will doubtless some day be renewed; meanwhile the breathing-time should be utilized in strengthening the weak places, and in educating the ignorant. The Church of England never stood more securely than it does at present; and the Historian of the future will have to relate, and prudent Statesmen will do well to bear in mind, that (A.D. 1895) the greatest political disaster of recent years befell the party which thought to tamper with the rights and property of the Church.

October, 1895.

CONTENTS.

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

(Page xiii.)

CHAPTER I.

THE EARLY APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

(Page 1.)

CHAPTER II.

THE LATER APOSTOLIC AGE.

(Page 47.)

CHAPTER III.

THE AGE OF THE PERSECUTIONS.

(Page 89.)

CHAPTER IV.

ATHANASIUS CONTRA MUNDUM.

(Page 134.)

CHAPTER V.

THE VICTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

(Page 176.)

CHAPTER VI.

THE WANDERING OF THE NATIONS.

(Page 210.)

CHAPTER VII.
GROWING TENSION BETWEEN EAST AND WEST.
(Page 247.)

CHAPTER VIII.
THE CONVERSION OF THE ENGLISH.
(Page 277.)

CHAPTER IX.
MAHOMETANISM.
(Page 309.)

CHAPTER X.
ICONOCLASM.
(Page 330.)

CHAPTER XI.
THE SCHISM BETWEEN EAST AND WEST.
(Page 365.)

CHAPTER XII.
THE BATTLE OF INVESTITURE.
(Page 401.)

CHAPTER XIII.
THE PAPACY AT ITS HEIGHT.
(Page 437.)

CHAPTER XIV.
THE CRUSADES—THE FRIARS—THE SCHOOLMEN.
(Page 477.)

CHAPTER XV.
THE EVE OF THE REFORMATION.
(Page 504.)

CHAPTER XVI.
THE THREE REFORMATIONS.
(Page 550.)

A.—THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION.
(Page 553.)

B.—THE ROMAN CATHOLIC REFORMATION.
(Page 601.)

C.—THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION.
(Page 623.)

INDEX.
(Page 652.)

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF PRINCIPAL EVENTS.

B. C.

3 or 4. Birth of our Saviour^a.

A. D.

30. The Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension and Day of Pentecost.

33. Martyrdom of St. Stephen.

34. Conversion of Saul.

38—41. St. Peter's Missionary journey, and conversion of Cornelius.

43. The Disciples first called Christians.

44. Martyrdom of St. James, brother of St. John.

45. Saul starts on his First Missionary journey.

50. Council of Jerusalem.

51. St. Paul starts on his Second Missionary journey (probably).

52—54. St. Paul's two Epistles to the Thessalonians.

54. St. Paul starts on his Third Missionary journey.

57. His two Epistles to the Corinthians.

58. His Epistle to the Romans.

58—60. His imprisonment at Cæsarea. Epistle of St. James.

61—63. His First imprisonment at Rome, during which he wrote his Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians.

62. Martyrdom of St. James, Bishop of Jerusalem.

64. First Epistle of St. Peter. Fire of Rome. Commencement of First Persecution of the Christians.

65—67. St. Paul's First Epistle to St. Timothy. His First Epistle to St. Titus. His imprisonment at Rome. Second Epistle to St. Timothy. St. Peter's Second Epistle.

68. Martyrdom of SS. Peter and Paul.

70. Destruction of Jerusalem by Titus.

81. St. Jude's Epistle (perhaps).

95. Persecution under Domitian. St. John's Gospel and Epistles (perhaps).

^a See p. 2. "The fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar" mentioned by St. Luke is to be reckoned from A.D. 12, when he became associated with Augustus in the Empire.

A.D.

- 96. The Book of Revelation.
- 99 (*circ.*). Death of St. John.
- 104. Martyrdom of St. Simeon. Pliny's letter to Trajan. Commencement of the Third Persecution.
- 114. Dedication of Trajan's Column at Rome.
- 115. Martyrdom of St. Ignatius.
- 160—230. Tertullian (perhaps).
- 163. Persecution under Marcus Aurelius commences. Martyrdom of St. Justin Martyr.
- 166. Martyrdom of St. Polycarp.
- 185—253. Origen.
- 202. Persecution under Septimius Severus.
- 235. Persecution under Maximin.
- 249. ————— Decius.
- 257. ————— Valerian.
- 258. St. Cyprian martyred.
- 275. Persecution under Aurelian.
- 296—373. St. Athanasius.
- 303—312. Diocletian Persecution.
- 305. Council of Elvira.
- 312. Constantine's Vision of the Cross.
- 313. Edict of Milan.
- 314. Council of Arles.
- 323. Christianity established as the religion of the Roman Empire.
- 324. Constantine sole Emperor.
- 325—389 (*circ.*). St. Gregory Nazianzen.
- 325. Council of Nice.
- 330—379. St. Basil the Great.
- 330. Dedication of New Rome or Constantinople.
- 336. Death of Arius.
- 337. Death of Constantine the Great.
- 347. Council of Sardica.
- 351. ————— Sirmium.
- 359. ————— Rimini.
- 378. Battle of Hadrianople.
- 379. Commencement of the reign of Theodosius.
- 381. First Council of Constantinople.
- 395. Death of the Emperor Theodosius.

A.D.

- 340—397 (*circ.*). St. Ambrose.
 404. Abolition of the Gladiatorial games.
 347—407. St. Chrysostom.
 409. Rome taken by Alaric.
 331—420 (*circ.*). St. Jerome.
 429. Pelagianism in Britain.
 354—430. St. Augustine.
 430. Athanasian Creed (perhaps).
 431. Council of Ephesus.
 440—461. Pontificate of Leo the Great.
 449. The Latrocinium.
 451. Council of Chalcedon. Battle of Chalons.
 454. Rome sacked by Genseric.
 476. Fall of the Western Empire.
 480—543. St. Benedict.
 484—519. Schism between Rome and Constantinople.
 492—496. Pontificate of Gelasius I.
 493—526. Theoderic, King of Italy.
 520. Battle of Mt. Badon.
 521—597. St. Columba.
 523—526. Pontificate of John I.
 527—565. Justinian I., Emperor.
 528. Foundation of Monte Casino.
 532. The Christian Era supersedes the Diocletian.
 536. Rome taken by Belisarius.
 537—555. Pontificate of Vigilius.
 543—615. St. Columban.
 553. Second Council of Constantinople.
 568. Settlement of the Lombards in Italy.
 570. Birth of Mahomet.
 587. Patriarch of Constantinople claims the title of Œcumenical Bishop.
 590—604. Pontificate of St. Gregory the Great.
 597. The Roman Mission to Britain.
 599. The Lombards converted from Arianism.
 622. The Hegira.
 625—638. Pontificate of Honorius I.
 637. Jerusalem taken by the Saracens.

A.D.

- 641. Alexandria taken by the Saracens.
- 664. Council of Whitby.
- 669. Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury.
- 673. Council of Hertford.
- 673—734. Bede.
- 675. Council of Toledo.
- 680. Council of Hatfield.
- 680. Third Council of Constantinople. Pope Honorius anathematized as a heretic.
- 682. Honorius anathematized by Pope Leo II.
- 691. The Quinsext Council. The Anathema of Pope Honorius confirmed.
- 692. Wilfrid preaches to the Frisians.
- 698. Carthage taken by the Saracens.
- 714. Spain conquered by the Saracens.
- 715—755. St. Boniface the Apostle of Germany.
- 716—741. Leo the Isaurian, Emperor.
- 726—842. The Iconoclastic Controversy.
- 732. Battle of Tours.
- 747. Council of Cloveshoo.
- 754. Iconoclastic Council at Constantinople. Pipin created Patriarch of Rome.
- 755. Commencement of the temporal power of the Popes.
- 768—814. Reign of Charlemagne.
- 787. Second Council of Nice. The Danes commence their ravages in England.
- 794. Council of Frankfort.
- 795—816. Pontificate of Leo III.
- 800. Revival of the Western Empire.
- 843. Treaty of Verdun.
- 857—891. The Photian Schism.
- 858—867. Pontificate of Nicholas I.
- 871—901. Reign of King Alfred.
- 891—896. Pontificate of Formosus.
- 955. John XII. at twelve years of age elected Pope.
- 959—988. Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury.
- 962—1002. The Three Ottos, Emperors.

A.D.

963. Otto I. in a Synod deposes the Pope.
 984—985. Pontificate of Boniface VII., the supposed murderer of two Popes.
 1002. Massacre of St. Bryce's Day.
 1012. Martyrdom of St. Alphege.
 1016—1035. Reign of Canute in England.
 1020. The Camaldolites founded.
 1028. The Order of Vallombrosa founded.
 1033. Benedict IX. at the age of ten elected Pope.
 1042—1066. Reign of Edward the Confessor.
 1045. Benedict sells the Papacy.
 1045—1046. Pontificate of Gregory VI.
 1048—1054.—Pontificate of Leo IX.
 1054. The great Schism between East and West.
 1059. Changes made in the mode of electing Popes.
 1065. Consecration of Westminster Abbey.
 1066. Battle of Hastings.
 1070—1088. Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury.
 1073—1085. Pontificate of Gregory VII.
 1073. Order of the Grandimontanes founded.
 1075. Commencement of the Investiture conflict. Canossa.
 1079—1142. Abelard.
 1080—1100. Clement III., Antipope.
 1084. Order of the Carthusians founded. Rome sacked by Guiscard.
 1091—1153. St. Bernard.
 1093—1109. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury.
 1095. Councils of Piacenza and Clermont
 1096. Departure of the First Crusade.
 1098 (*circ.*). Order of Cistercians founded. Council of Bari.
 1099. Jerusalem recovered by the Crusaders.
 1099—1188. Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.
 1115. The Order of Clair-Vaux founded.
 1119. The Order of Premonstratensians founded.
 1122. End of the Investiture conflict.
 1138. Commencement of the Hohenstaufen dynasty.
 1144—1154. Arnold of Brescia.

A.D.

1147. Second Crusade preached by St. Bernard.
1152—1190. Frederic I. (Barbarossa), Emperor.
1154—1159. Pontificate of Hadrian IV.
1159—1181. Pontificate of Alexander III.
1160. The Order of Carmelites founded.
1162. Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury.
1164. The Constitutions of Clarendon.
1170. Martyrdom of Becket.
1170—1221. St. Dominic Guzman, founder of the Dominican Order.
1177. Barbarossa does Penance at Milan.
1179. Change made in the election of Popes.
1182—1226. St. Francis of Assisi, the founder of the Franciscan Order.
1189. Jerusalem taken by Saladin. Third Crusade.
1193. Death of Saladin.
1198—1216. Pontificate of Innocent III.
1202. The Fourth Crusade leaves Venice.
1204. The Crusaders pillage Constantinople.
1204—1261. Latin Empire at Constantinople.
1213. The Children's Crusade.
1215. Magna Charta signed. Transubstantiation made a Roman doctrine.
1220. Frederic II. crowned Emperor.
1226—1270. St. Louis, King of France.
1226. Commencement of Papal exactions in England.
1227—1239. Pope Gregory IX. four times excommunicates the Emperor.
1229. The Fifth Crusade.
1234—1240. St. Edmund Rich, Archbishop of Canterbury.
1240. The Sixth Crusade.
1248. The Seventh Crusade.
1250. The Carmelites come to England.
1252. The Austin Friars come to England.
1261—1453. The reign of the Palæologi.
1265. Simon de Montfort's Parliament.
1268. Execution of Conradin.

A.D.

- 1270. The Eighth Crusade.
- 1273. Commencement of the Hapsburg Dynasty.
- 1274. Second Council of Lyons.
- 1282. The Sicilian Vespers.
- 1294. Boniface VIII. elected Pope.
- 1295. Commencement of the present system of English Parliaments.
- 1296. The Clericis Laicos, Bull.
- 1303. Unam Sanctam, Bull.
- 1305—1314. Pontificate of Clement V.
- 1312. Exivi de Paradiso, Bull.
- 1317. Gloriosam Ecclesiam, Bull.
- 1309—1377. The Papacy at Avignon.
- 1312. The Order of Knights Templar dissolved.
- 1324—1384 (*circ.*). John Wicliffe.
- 1316—1334. Pontificate of John XXII.
- 1324. John excommunicates the Emperor Lewis IV.
- 1344. Diet of Frankfort.
- 1347. The Revolution under Rienzi.
- 1378—1471. The Papal Schism.
- 1327—1377. Reign of Edward III. of England.
- 1351. First Statute of Provisors.
- 1353. First Statute of Præmunire.
- 1356. The Golden Bull.
- 1365. Second Statute of Præmunire.
- 1381. Murder of Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury.
- 1382. The Earthquake Council.
- 1389—1464. Cosmo de' Medici.
- 1390. Fresh Statute of Provisors.
- 1393. Fresh Statute of Præmunire.
- 1401. Statute de Hæretico Comburendo.
- 1406. Freedom from Rome asserted by the Gallican Church.
- 1409. Council of Pisa.
- 1410—1415. Pontificate of John XXIII.
- 1414—1418. Council of Constance.
- 1415. Celebration of the Eucharist in One Kind only decreed.
John Huss burnt.
- 1416. Jerome of Prague burnt.

A.D.

- 1417—1431. Pontificate of Martin V.
 1431—1439. Pontificate of Eugenius IV. Council of Basle.
 1438. The Pragmatic Sanction.
 1447—1455. Pontificate of Nicolas V.
 1448—1492. Lorenzo de' Medici.
 1452. Invention of Printing.
 1452—1498. Savonarola.
 1453. Taking of Constantinople by the Turks.
 1455—1522. John Reuchlin.
 1455—1485. Wars of the Roses.
 1467—1536. Erasmus.
 1482—1531. Œcolampadius.
 1483—1546. Martin Luther.
 1484—1531. Ulrich Zwingli.
 1488—1522. Ulrich von Hutten.
 1491—1556. Ignatius Loyola.
 1492—1503. Pontificate of Alexander VI.
 1497—1560. Melanchthon.
 1497. North America discovered.
 1502. University of Wittenberg founded.
 1503—1512. Pontificate of Julius II.
 1505—1572. John Knox.
 1506—1552. St. Francis Xavier.
 1509—1564. John Calvin.
 1511. The Cardinals suspend the Pope.
 1513—1521. Pontificate of Leo X.
 1515—1595. St. Philip of Neri.
 1516. Erasmus publishes his New Testament. French Concordat.
 1517. Luther publishes his Ninety-five Theses.
 1519—1556. Charles V., Emperor of Germany.
 1519—1589. Catharine de' Medici.
 1520. Luther publishes his work On the Babylonish Captivity. Exsurge Domine, Bull.
 1521. Luther condemned by an Edict of Worms. Henry VIII. publishes his work on the Seven Sacraments.
 1523—1534. Pontificate of Clement VII.

A.D.

- 1524. Order of Theatines founded. The Peasants' War.
- 1525. Luther's marriage. Battle of Pavia. Order of Capuchins founded. The Holy Alliance.
- 1527. Rome sacked by Charles V. Pope Clement VII. made a prisoner in the Castle of St. Angelo.
- 1529. Peace of Cambray. The Lutherans called Protestants at Second Diet of Spires. Conference at Marburg.
- 1530—1556. Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury.
- 1530. Diet of Augsburg.
- 1531. The Schmalcaldic League formed. Battle of Cappel.
- 1532. Religious Peace of Nuremberg. The Order of the Paulines founded.
- 1532. The Pope summons Henry VIII. to appear before him at Rome.
- 1534—1549. Pontificate of Paul III.
- 1534. The English Convocation pronounces against the Pope's Supremacy. Henry VIII. declared Head of the English Church. Anabaptist Riots at Münster.
- 1535. Diet of Schmalcald. Calvin's Institutes published.
- 1536. Confiscation of the Smaller Monasteries in England.
- 1537. Henry declared Head of the Irish Church.
- 1539. The Order of Jesuits founded. Confiscation of the Larger Monasteries.
- 1541. Interim of Ratisbon. Loyola, General of the Jesuits.
- 1543. Injunctum Vobis, Bull.
- 1544. Calvin permanently takes up his residence in Geneva.
- 1544. Peace of Crespy. Order of the Ursulines founded.
- 1545—1563. Council of Trent.
- 1546. The Schmalcaldic War.
- 1548. The Interim of Augsburg. Adiaphoristic Controversy.
- 1551. The Oratorians founded. The English Prayer-Book forced on the Irish Church.
- 1552. Treaty of Passau.
- 1554. Reginald Pole reconciles England to Rome.
- 1555—1559. Pontificate of Paul IV.
- 1555. Religious Peace of Augsburg. Several English Bishops (amongst them Latimer and Ridley) burnt.

A.D.

- 1556. Archbishop Cranmer burnt. Pole, Archbishop of Canterbury.
 - 1558. Death of Pole. Francis II. of France marries Mary, Queen of Scots.
 - 1559—1565. Pontificate of Pius IV.
 - 1559. Parker consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury.
 - 1562. Edict of Toleration granted to the Huguenots.
 - 1564. Index of the Council of Trent published. The Creed of Pius IV. published.
 - 1565. The English Prayer-Book superseded in Scotland.
 - 1566. The Catechism of the Council of Trent published.
 - 1568. Jesuit Seminary of Douay founded.
 - 1570. Pius V. by Bull *Regnans in Excelsis* excommunicates Queen Elizabeth. Toleration of Huguenots in France.
 - 1572. Massacre of St. Bartholomew's.
 - 1573. The Catholic League formed.
 - 1578. Jesuit Seminary of Rome founded.
 - 1587. Execution of Mary, Queen of Scots.
 - 1588. Destruction of the Spanish Armada.
 - 1590. Revision of the Vulgate.
 - 1591. Foundation of Trinity College, Dublin.
 - 1592. Presbyterianism established in Scotland.
 - 1593. A further revision of the Vulgate.
 - 1598. Edict of Nantes.
-

Not the least difficult part in writing a somewhat difficult work has been the Chronology, and the unusually large number of dates, in comparison with its length, which, for the assistance of the reader, have been introduced into the Book. In dealing with them, in spite of great care in reading and revising proofs, errors will creep in. Such as the Author has detected, he has noted in the following *Errata*.

ERRATA.

- p. 47, line 6 from bottom, *omit* it.
- „ 49, „ 6 from bottom, *for* sister *read* daughter.
- „ 71, „ 4, *for* 67 *read* 68.
- „ 81, „ 3 from bottom, *for* therefore *read* perhaps.
- „ 93, „ 5, *for* 111 *read* 117.
- „ 94, „ 4 from bottom, *for* 107 *read* 104.
- „ 112, „ 9, *for* vigorous *read* rigorous.
- „ 149, „ 3 from bottom, *for* form *read* power.
- „ 201, „ 2 from bottom, *for* Cyprian *read* Cyril.
- „ 202, „ 8, *for* Theodosius *read* Theophilus.
- „ 210, „ 24, *dele* “ Preaching of the Gospel in Ireland—In Scotland—
Iona.”
- „ 213, line 9 from bottom, *read* “ a Vandal, like himself, of.”
- „ 242, „ 22, *for* and who *read* who.
- „ 253, „ 3, *for* yet *read* oft.
- „ 292, „ 18, *for* 681 *read* 680.
- „ 328, „ 9 from bottom, *for* Monophysite *read* Monothelite ; and in line
following *for* Nature *read* Will.
- „ 341, „ 9, and 353, line 8, *for* Stephen I. *read* Stephen II., and *infra*
for Stephen II. *read* Stephen III.
- „ 367, line 11, *for* Leo I. *read* Leo III.
- „ 402, „ 18, *for* 832 *read* 838.
- „ 515, „ 5 from bottom, *for* 1536 *read* 1356.
- „ 530, „ 21, *for* 1416 *read* 1415.
- „ 571, „ 16, *for* II. *read* VI.
- „ 588, „ 8 from bottom, *for* were *read* was.
- „ 596, „ 16, *for* before *read* after.
- „ 626, „ 5 from bottom, *for* some *read* seven.
- „ 642, „ 6, *for* fermented *read* fomented.

CHAPTER I.

THE EARLY APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

THE Foundation of the Christian Church—Our Saviour's earthly Ministry—Election of Matthias—The Day of Pentecost—Miracle at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple—Peter and John imprisoned—Barnabas—Ananias and Sapphira—Gamaliel—Murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews—The Seven Deacons—Martyrdom of St. Stephen—Philip—Conversion of Samaria—Simon Magus—Conversion of Saul—Saul in Arabia—And in Damascus—And in Jerusalem—Æneas cured of the palsy—Cornelius—The Gospel preached to the Gentiles—Antioch—Disciples first called Christians—The Presbyters—Martyrdom of St. James the brother of John—Peter delivered from prison by an Angel—Ordination of Barnabas and Saul—Saul, accompanied by Barnabas and Mark, sets out on his First Apostolic Journey—Sergius Paulus—Saul called Paul—Mark abandons the Mission—Controversy about Circumcision—Council of Jerusalem—Paul rebukes Peter—Second Apostolic Journey—Timothy—Luke—Conversion of the jailor at Philippi—Thessalonica—Berea—Athens—Corinth—Cenchrea—Jerusalem—Antioch—Paul's Third Apostolic Journey—Ephesus—Corinth—Jerusalem.

THE birthday of the Christian Church was the Day of Pentecost, A.D. 30, and its birth-place Jerusalem.

When our Lord said to Peter, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church," it is evident He was speaking of an event not as yet, although speedily to be, accomplished. The Christian Church was built, as the Collect of SS. Simon and Jude's Day says, "on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head Corner-stone."

The earthly Ministry of our Lord was devoted to the performance of acts of benevolence and mercy, and laying the foundation-stone of His Church. He instituted two Sacraments, Baptism at the commencement, and the Holy Eucharist at the close, of His Ministry; He chose twelve Apostles, the precursors of the Bishops of His Church, to whom He explained "the mysteries of the kingdom of God," and whom He trained in the manner best suited for the arduous task before them, to eleven of whom

(for one of them was a traitor) He delegated authority to act in His name, and to perfect the work which He Himself had begun. "He appointed other seventy also," the forerunners of the second Order in His Ministry.

Of the early years of our Saviour's life on earth we know but little. Born at Bethlehem in accordance with the prophecy of Micah (Micah v. 2), about four years before the commencement of the traditional Christian era; circumcised after the Law of Moses on the eighth day, and named Jesus as the Angel had commanded, He was conveyed by His parents into Egypt, Joseph His father having been warned in a dream that King Herod the Great sought the young Child's life. On the death of Herod, which occurred two years after the Saviour's birth, the Emperor Augustus divided his dominions between his three surviving sons, Archelaus, Antipas, and Philip, the two last reigning over the Central and North-Eastern portions with the rank of Tetrarchs, whilst Judæa, with Idumea and Samaria, fell to Archelaus. Joseph was then commanded by an Angel to return to the land of Israel, but when he learnt that Archelaus reigned over Judæa in the place of his father, he was afraid to go thither, and being again warned by God in a dream, turned aside into the parts of Galilee and dwelt at Nazareth.

For twelve years after His birth we hear nothing further of Him except that "the Child grew and waxed strong in spirit, and the grace of God was upon Him." When He was twelve years old, He was taken by His parents to Jerusalem for the Feast of the Passover, and so disputed with the Doctors in the Temple, that "they were astonished at His understanding and answers." From that time we again lose sight of Him for eighteen years; we only know that "He dwelt with His parents at Nazareth and was subject unto them;" that He followed His father's trade as a carpenter (Mark vi. 3); and that "He increased in wisdom and stature and in favour with God and Man."

Meanwhile (A.D. 7), Archelaus having been deposed for misgovernment and banished to Vienne in Gaul, the countries of Judæa, Samaria, and Idumea were placed under Procurators (A.D. 7-41), or Governors (Matt. xxvii. 2), who were responsible to the Presidents of Syria; and the power of life and death was taken from the Jews. Thus they lost even the semblance of authority, and their subjection to Rome was complete. The sceptre had departed from Judah (Gen. xlix. 9) at the very time that Shiloh, the Messiah, came.

The Emperor Augustus, in whose reign the Saviour was born, dying A.D. 14, was succeeded by Tiberius (14-37). In the fifteenth year of his reign, John the Baptist, at that time thirty years of age, began to preach "the Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," and to foretell the advent of One mightier than he, "the latchet of whose shoes he was unworthy to loose," who would "baptize them with the Holy Ghost and with fire."

In the following year Jesus went from Nazareth and was baptized by John in the river Jordan, for thus He said "it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." He that "knew no sin" was "made sin for us," that in the Water of Baptism He might condemn sin in the flesh.

Soon afterwards, being then thirty years of age (the age at which the Jewish Priests entered on their ministry), Jesus began His Ministry, which lasted part of three years. Avoiding all earthly grandeur, He was contented to be "despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." There were few that followed Him; the many and more influential among the people, instigated by the Jewish priests and Pharisees, rose up against Him. "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not." Even His brethren misunderstood His character. Again and again we are told in the Gospels that they understood not His sayings, and that they were hid from them; and that they were afraid to ask Him their meaning. They

expected, as they hoped, that He would set up a temporal kingdom, and deliver them from their bondage to the Romans. Even on His very last day on earth they asked Him, "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" They never believed in Him as a suffering Messiah, whose kingdom was not of this world. One of the twelve, Judas Iscariot, betrayed Him for thirty pieces of silver (*τριάκοντα ἀργύρια*), the mere price of a slave (Ex. xxi. 32); Peter thrice denied Him; all His disciples forsook Him and fled.

Six days before the last Passover He went to Bethany, a village about two miles distant from Jerusalem, where Lazarus, whom He had raised from the dead, resided with his two sisters Martha and Mary. From Bethany He proceeded to the Mount of Olives, whence, on the day before the Passover, "the first day of unleavened bread," He directed Peter and John to go into Jerusalem and prepare the Passover. He told them they would find a man bearing a pitcher of water, whom they were to follow into the house whither he went, and to demand of the goodman of the house the guestchamber, where He might eat the Passover with His disciples. He would show them a large upper room furnished. Finding it as He had directed them, there they made the preparations, and in the evening the Saviour Himself entered the city and eat with them the last Passover. Whilst they were eating, He instituted the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and afterwards foretold the betrayal of Judas. After Judas had gone out, He gave them the new commandment, by which all men should know that they were His disciples, that they should love one another, and foretold that Peter should deny Him. Afterwards He went, as He was wont, to the Mount of Olives, and passing the brook Cedron, entered the Garden of Gethsemane, a word signifying *oil-press*, the place, that is, where the olives were bruised and crushed, a fitting emblem of His approaching agony. Here it was that Judas betrayed Him, and that all His disciples forsook Him.

He was first taken to the High Priest's Palace, the scene of the thrice-repeated denial of Peter, and after examination by the High Priest and Sanhedrim, He was condemned as guilty of blasphemy and deserving death, because He said He was the Son of God. Next, as the Jews had lost the power of inflicting death, He was taken before Pontius Pilate the Procurator, who, after examination, and having twice acknowledged that he found no fault in Him, yet, "willing to content the people," having first scourged Him, delivered Him to be crucified. So the Saviour of the world, in the thirty-third year of His life, suffered the most painful and ignominious death of the Cross, between two malefactors. In the evening, Joseph of Arimathæa begged the Body from Pilate, and laid It in his own tomb, the Chief-Priests and Pharisees making "the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch."

From Friday, the day of the Crucifixion, till the following Sunday, "the first day of the week," the Body of the Saviour lay in the tomb. After His Resurrection on the Easter morn, He remained on earth forty days, instructing the disciples as to their future duties, and "speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God." His unexpected appearances and equally sudden disappearances during those mysterious forty days, prepared them for His Bodily absence but Spiritual presence with His Church. "He breathed on them, and saith unto them, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.'" He then led them as far as Bethany, and gave them their commission to "go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost." And to this He added the promise of His ever-abiding presence in His Church, "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." He then blessed them, and whilst He was blessing them, "a cloud received Him out of their sight, and He was carried up into Heaven."

No doubt the feeling that their Lord and Master was now in Heaven must greatly have reconciled the disciples to the great loss which they had sustained; and so we are told "they worshipped Him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy." There He had commanded them to tarry, "until they should be endued with grace from on high," and to "wait for the promise of the Comforter."

The first step taken by the eleven Apostles after the Ascension, was to elect a twelfth Apostle in the place of Judas. The traitor repenting, when it was too late, of having betrayed the Saviour, "went and hanged himself" (Matt. xxvii. 5); and (it has been surmised), falling from the height on which he was suspended, fell headlong to the ground, and "burst asunder in the midst" (Acts i. 18). The Apostles being assembled with one accord (*ὁμοθυμαδόν*) in *the* upper room (*τὸ ὑπερῶον*, probably the same room in which Jesus had eaten the last supper with them and instituted the Eucharist), were engaged in prayer and supplication, together with His mother (whose name is here mentioned for the last time in Holy Scripture) and His brethren, and the women who had followed Jesus, and about one hundred and twenty members of the infant Church.

Peter invited them to fill up the vacancy in the Apostolate. Two men, from the number of those who had followed them from the first, were nominated, Joseph called Barsabas, surnamed Justus, and Matthias (this is the first and last time that they are mentioned in the New Testament); and after prayer to God for guidance they gave forth their lots (*κλήρους*, hence the word *clergy*), and "the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven Apostles."

On Sunday, May 27, ten days after the Ascension, the promise of the Saviour of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the Apostles was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, or, as it was called by the Jews, the Feast of Weeks, being seven weeks, and in round numbers fifty days, after the Feast of Passover. The

day was particularly appropriate. The ingathering of the harvest from the fields (Levit. xxiii. 9—16) typified the ingathering from the world of the Spiritual harvest by the Holy Ghost. As the Mosaical Law, written on two tables of stone, had been given on the Day of Pentecost, it was fitting that the Christian Law, given by the same Divine Author, to be written, not on tables of stone, but on the fleshy tables of the heart (Jer. xxxi. 33), should also be given on Pentecost, the first festival following the great day on which “Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us.”

Unlike the two other great Feasts, those of the Passover and Tabernacles, which extended over seven days, the Feast of Weeks was confined to one day (Deut. xvi.). The restriction to one day, as it would ensure a larger attendance at the same time, so also would it secure the attendance in one and the same place. And so we read, “when the Day of Pentecost was fully come (συνπληροῦσθαι), they were all with one accord in one place.” The Jews, who were widely dispersed throughout the world (ἡ διασπορά), considered Jerusalem as their capital, and were in the habit of resorting thither for the principal festivals. There were at that time residing in Jerusalem “Jews, devout men out of every nation under Heaven.” It was the third hour of the day (nine o’clock in the morning), which was one of the usual hours of prayer, and therefore the time when the Temple was most likely to be thronged with worshippers. “Suddenly there came from Heaven a sound as of a mighty rushing wind;” “cloven tongues, like as of fire,” descended upon each of the Apostles, and straightway those uneducated and unlearned fishermen, being filled with the Holy Ghost, were able to speak to strangers gathered from every quarter of the globe, in the familiar language of their own countries. Peter, in a sermon, explained to them that this outpouring of the Spirit was the fulfilment of prophecy (Joel ii. 28—32), and that though they “with wicked hands had crucified and slain” the Saviour, yet it had been fore-ordained “by the determinate counsel and

fore-knowledge of God." So "pricked to the heart" were they, that about three thousand were converted, and thus became the first-fruits of the Christian Church. Their admission into the Church was by the Sacrament of Baptism, on the authority given to the Apostles by the Saviour, "Go ye and teach (*μαθητεύσατε*, make disciples of) all nations, baptizing them."

Thus Jerusalem was the Mother Church of Christianity, and St. Peter the rock on which the Church was built, in accordance with the promise of the Saviour (Matt. xvi. 18), (for we take this to be the simplest and most literal meaning of the passage), "Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church."

The little community "continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of Bread, and in prayers." Like their Master, who was born and lived and died a Jew, they observed the Ceremonies of the Mosaic Law, and frequented the services of the Temple. But the breaking of Bread in the Eucharist (the distinguishing feature of the Christian life) they celebrated "from house to house" (*κατ' οἶκον*, which, however, perhaps means the *upper room*); and "the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved." (*τοὺς σωζομένους*, those who were placed in a *state of salvation* through Baptism.)

After a miracle of curing a man more than fifty years of age who had been a cripple from his birth, performed by SS. Peter and John at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple, and a second sermon by Peter at the ninth hour of the day (or three o'clock in the afternoon), when the Temple would be most crowded with worshippers, in which he told them that though they had killed the Prince of life, yet God had raised Him from the dead, and that "faith in Him had made this man strong whom ye see and know," "many of those who heard the Word believed, and the number of the men was about five thousand."

The first persecution of the Church now arose from the Sadducees, a sect of the Jews which denied the doctrine of the

resurrection from the dead. The Priests and Captain of the Temple and the Sadducees were so incensed with Peter's sermon, that (it being now evening) they "put them in hold till the next day;" after which they were brought before the Sanhedrim, who enquired, "By what power or by what name have ye done this?" Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, again boldly told them that by the name of "Jesus Christ of Nazareth, Whom ye crucified, Whom God raised from the dead, even by Him doth this man stand here before you whole." Seeing the healed cripple standing amongst them, they could say nothing further, and were afraid of punishing them because of the people, for "all men glorified God for that which was done." So having cautioned them to speak no more in the name of Jesus, they let them go.

The Apostles, nothing daunted, joined their own company; and whilst they prayed and glorified God for what had happened, a second outpouring of the Spirit occurred; the place where they were assembled was shaken, and with renewed gifts of the Holy Ghost, "they spake the Word with boldness," and gave witness to the Resurrection of Jesus. So enthusiastic was the spirit which prevailed amongst the converts, that those who had possessions (amongst whom was Joses, surnamed Barnabas, a Levite of Cyprus), sold them and formed a common stock which they laid at the Apostles' feet, for distribution amongst the poor. The contribution was voluntary; but when Ananias and Sapphira kept part of the price, and tried to deceive the Apostles with a lie, the awful punishment inflicted on them taught the whole Church that they had tempted the Spirit of God, and had not lied unto men but unto God.

Many signs and wonders continued to be wrought by the Apostles, and multitudes of believers, both men and women, were added to the Lord. Again the High Priest and Sadducees laid hands upon the Apostles, and put them in the common prison; but the Angel of the Lord by night opened the prison doors, and set

them free; and early in the morning they again entered the Temple and taught. Thereupon the High Priest and the Sanhedrim, and all the Senate (not now Sadducees only, but the whole Council "of the Children of Israel") were only prevented from killing them by the jealousy which existed between the two great sects, the Pharisees and Sadducees. Gamaliel, a Pharisee, an eminent doctor of the law, on whom the lustre is thrown of having been the tutor of St. Paul, unwilling to give the Sadducees a triumph by punishing men for preaching the Resurrection, gave his advice, that if the cause were of men it would come to nought, as had been the case with previous impostors, but that if it were of God, they would only be fighting against God, and could not overthrow it. His counsel was accepted, and the Apostles, after having been beaten, and commanded not to speak in the name of Jesus, were let go. They rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer for Him, and ceased not to teach and preach Jesus daily in the Temple and "in every house." After this there was a cessation of persecution for two years.

It broke out again in consequence of a decision of the Church, which was the more important from the consequences to which it led. At a time when there was assembled at Jerusalem a large concourse of foreign Jews, there arose a murmuring on the part of those who spoke the Greek language (*τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν*) against the Jews of Palestine who spoke the Hebrew language (*τοὺς Ἑβραίους*), because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration of the alms of the Church. The Apostles recognising the justice of the complaint, and feeling the difficulty of combining in their own persons the double duty of preaching the Gospel and distributing the alms, "seven persons of honest report and full of the Holy Ghost" were chosen by the people, and ordained, after prayer, by the Apostles, primarily to superintend this special work (*διακονεῖν τραπέζαις*, to serve tables), but also for the higher office of preaching and baptizing. Thus

another Order in the Christian Ministry, that of Deacons, was instituted. It may here be mentioned that though the name of *Deacon* was by the earliest writers of the Church applied to the *Seven*, yet St. Luke does not use the name, nor, although it soon afterwards designated a distinct Order (Phil. i. 1, 1 Tim. iii.), is it ever given to them in the New Testament. Of five of the number no further mention is made, nor do we know anything of their history, unless Nicolas, who is described by St. Luke (Acts vi. 5) as a Proselyte of Antioch, gave his name to the sect of the Nicolaitans, mentioned in the Book of Revelation (Rev. ii. 6, 15). Chief amongst the Seven were Stephen and Philip, the former of whom stands out as one of the purest and saintliest characters of the Apostolic age, "a man full of faith and the Holy Ghost;" and bears the noble title of Protomartyr of the Christian Church.

Stephen, "full of faith and power, did great wonders and miracles among the people." He soon met with violent persecution. Certain men of the Synagogue of the Libertines (a sect amongst the Jews who having been brought as prisoners of war into Rome by Pompey before the commencement of the Christian era, had afterwards gained their liberty, and were now living in Jerusalem); and inhabitants of Cyrene and Alexandria (in which cities a large proportion of the citizens were Jews), and of Cilicia (perhaps amongst them Saul, a native of Tarsus, was included); and of Proconsular Asia, of which Ephesus was the capital; men who had probably come to Jerusalem to attend some Feast; not being able to resist his teaching by fair means, suborned witnesses, who brought against Stephen a similar charge to that previously brought against the Saviour (Matt. xxvi. 60, 61), of blasphemy. "We have heard him say that Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us."

It is impossible to say whether he used the words or not; it is certain that he did not use them in the sense which his

enemies meant to convey. Not the Sadducees only, but the Pharisees also, were arraigned against Stephen. The eyes of the Sanhedrim (and perhaps Saul was one of them), fixed steadfastly upon him, beheld his face as the face of an Angel. The noble defence which he made; the spiritual interpretation which he gave to the Mosaical Law; the accusation which he threw back upon them, cut his opponents to the heart. They were, he told them, "stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears," who, like their fathers, always resisted the Holy Ghost. Their fathers had persecuted and slain the prophets who foretold the coming of Christ, and now they themselves had slain the Just One. Smarting under the truth of the accusation, they "gnashed upon him with their teeth." Unmoved by the angry scene before him, and the menacing hatred of his judges, Stephen, full of the Holy Ghost, looking up to Heaven, told them how he saw the heavens opened, and "the Son of Man standing on the right Hand of God." This only served to increase their fury and his guilt of blasphemy. Stopping their ears, and rushing upon him with a loud voice, they cast him out of the city and stoned him, Stephen ending his life with a prayer to God that the sin might not be laid to their charge.

Such a noble character as that of St. Stephen, and such patient endurance under suffering, whilst they were the strongest evidence of the faith for which he died, were also a powerful stimulus and encouragement to the Church. The blood of martyrs was the seed of the Church (*sanguis martyrum semen ecclesiæ*). The violent persecution of the Church in Jerusalem which ensued only led to the diffusion of Christianity, for those who were driven out from the city "went everywhere preaching the Gospel."

In connection with the martyrdom of St. Stephen is the first mention made in the Acts of the Apostles of Saul. The witnesses whom they had suborned to give false evidence, in order that they might thus be unencumbered in stoning Stephen,

“laid down their clothes at a young man’s feet whose name was Saul.”

The first effect of the martyrdom was the acceptance of the Gospel by the Samaritans. The Samaritans, who inhabited the border-land between Judæa and Galilee, of whom mention is often made in the Gospels, were a mixed race, half Jews, half Gentiles, the remnant of the Israelites who were not taken into the Assyrian captivity (2 Kings xviii.), and who became afterwards intermixed with colonists from different parts of the Assyrian Empire. Thus their religion became one of a mixed character, partly Jewish, partly heathen ; and after the return of the Jews from captivity, jealous of the erection of the Second Temple at Jerusalem, they built for themselves a Temple on Mount Gerizim. They received no part of the Jewish Scriptures except the Pentateuch, and rejected all traditions. From such causes arose the bitter hatred which existed in the time of our Saviour between the two people ; and hence we read, “the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.”

It was to this people that the Gospel was now to be preached. Chief amongst the Deacons, after St. Stephen’s death, was Philip, the same who is afterwards called (Acts xxi. 8) Philip the Evangelist, who, escaping into Samaria, preached and worked miracles, with the result that many were converted and baptized. One of the converts was Simon, a native of Gittim in Samaria, better known as Simon Magus, who had before bewitched the people by his sorceries, giving out that he “himself was some great one,” so that he was regarded by all, from the least to the greatest, as “the great power of God.” Philip being a Deacon, could only confer on the new converts the Sacrament of Baptism. But when the Apostles at Jerusalem heard of the success which had attended his preaching, they sent to Samaria Peter and John, who laid their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost. This is the first mention which we have of Confirmation.

When Simon saw that through laying on of the Apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he, supposing that they possessed some magic power superior to his own, offered to purchase it from them by money; hence the word *Simony* is derived. This brought upon him a severe rebuke from St. Peter, which produced in him a temporary repentance. That it was only temporary we shall see later on.

Peter and John then returned to Jerusalem, preaching the Gospel on the way in many villages of the Samaritans. But Philip, instructed by an Angel, went into the desert country of Gaza, one of the five cities of the Philistines. There he met the Chamberlain of Candace, Queen of Ethiopia, a man of great authority, who, having gone to Jerusalem to worship, was now, on his return journey, passing along the road that led to Gaza. He was reading in his chariot the passage from the fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah, relating to the humiliation and death of Christ. Philip, being commanded by the Spirit, joined the chariot, and explained to him the meaning of the passage, and its reference to Jesus, with the result that the Chamberlain expressed his belief "that Jesus is the Son of God," and was baptized. Thus by means of Philip the words of prophecy were fulfilled, "Upon Philistia will I triumph" (Psalm viii. 9); "Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hands unto God" (Psalm lxviii. 31). Having performed the work which God had appointed him to do, "the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip," who then preached the Gospel from Azotus, or Ashdod, (another of the cities of Philistia), to Cæsarea. There Philip, who was a married man, fixed his abode with his four daughters, who, we are informed, possessed the gift of prophecy; and there he afterwards entertained St. Paul (Acts xxi. 8, 9), and is supposed to have ended his days.

In the persecution of the Church which ensued on the death of St. Stephen, Saul bore a prominent part. A Pharisee of the tribe of Benjamin (Rom. xi. 1), a Hebrew of the Hebrews

(Philip. iii. 5), he was a native of Tarsus, the capital of Cilicia, a city in point of learning the rival of Athens and Alexandria, which having sided with the Emperor Augustus in the civil wars, had been rewarded with the privileges of Roman citizenship. Hence we shall find St. Paul afterwards claimed his rights as a Roman citizen. He was sent by his father to Jerusalem to the school of Gamaliel, the most celebrated teacher of the day, Barnabas, perhaps, being a pupil with him in the same school. He there received a liberal education, whilst through his birth-place he had the means of acquiring a knowledge of Grecian literature. Agreeably to the custom prevalent amongst the Jews, by which their youths (whether it was necessary or not as a means of gaining a livelihood, and in Saul's case no such necessity seems to have existed) were taught some trade, he was brought up as a tent-maker (*σκηνοποιός*), which in his after-life proved of advantage to him, as it enabled him to minister to his own wants without being an encumbrance upon others (Acts xx. 34). And that he sometimes refers to this custom, we shall see as we proceed.

Whether or not in the interval between his education and the martyrdom of St. Stephen, he returned to Tarsus, we have no means of judging. At the time of the latter event he was a *young man*, but that tells us very little, for the Greek word (*νεανίας*) includes any age between twenty-four and over thirty years; but from the position which he is supposed to have held in the Sanhedrim, we may infer that he was not far short of thirty years of age. He grew up a man of unblemished moral character, so that he could appeal to the Jews who had known him from the beginning, that "after the most straitest sect of their religion" he lived a Pharisee (Acts xxvi. 5), and was "touching the righteousness which is by the law, blameless" (Philip. iii. 6). The conversion of such a man, the other Apostles being unlearned and uneducated, was the very thing needed for the diffusion of the Gospel, and for the particular

work which was assigned to him, as the Apostle of the Gentiles, of uniting Jews and Gentiles under one faith.

The first effect produced upon him by St. Stephen's martyrdom was to increase his hatred to the new religion. "As for Saul, he made havoc of the Church, and having received authority from the chief Priests, he entered into every house (in Jerusalem), and haling men and women, committed them to prison. Thinking, as he himself said afterwards (Acts xxvi. 9), that he "ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth," he was "very mad" against the Christians, and compelled many of them to deny the Saviour and blaspheme Christ. Not contented with persecuting the Christians in Jerusalem, "breathing out threatenings and slaughter," he "persecuted them even to strange cities;" and obtained from the High-Priests a commission to the rulers of the Synagogue at Damascus, a city distant one hundred and thirty-three miles from Jerusalem, giving him authority to seize and bring bound to Jerusalem any Christians who had fled for refuge to that city.

Nothing short of a miracle could have diverted a mind like Saul's from his purpose. Not till he had nearly reached Damascus was he arrested in his work of persecution, and the great event which then happened is perhaps, next to the Crucifixion of our Saviour, the most momentous one in the world's history.

About noon (Acts xxii. 6), under a great light which shone from Heaven, above the brightness of the sun (Acts xxvi. 13), he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying in the Hebrew tongue, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me? it is hard for thee to kick against the goad" (*πρὸς κέντρα λατίζειν*, the word meaning the *scourge* employed in driving oxen). To his question, "Who art thou, Lord?" he received the answer, "I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest." Trembling and astonished, he then asked, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" "Rise and stand up on thy feet," he was told (Acts xxvi. 16), "and

go into the city, and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed thee to do " (Acts xxii. 10).

His companions who were, like himself, smitten to the ground, (Acts xxvi. 14), saw indeed the light (Acts xxii. 9), but saw no man (Acts ix. 7); neither did they hear the voice (Acts xxii. 9); or if they did hear it (Acts ix. 7), they remained speechless. We cannot wonder when we are told that "they were afraid," (Acts xxii. 9). "Blinded by the glory of the light" (Acts xxii. 11), Saul "saw no man" (Acts ix. 8), and it was necessary that he should be led by his companions to Damascus. There he remained three days without sight (Acts xxii. 11), during which time, probably in the bitterness of remorse and repentance for the past, he "neither eat nor drank."

In this state he awaited the accomplishment of a vision which had been vouchsafed to him, of "a man named Ananias coming in and putting his hand upon him that he might receive his sight." As to Ananias we know little. We are told that he was a disciple (Acts ix. 10), and "devout according to the Law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt at Damascus" (Acts xxii. 12); an untrustworthy tradition makes him to have been afterwards Bishop of Damascus. At the same time that the vision appeared to Saul, another vision vouchsafed to Ananias commanded the latter to go into the street which was called Straight, and to enquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul of Tarsus. Ananias was not ignorant of the character which attached to Saul (Acts ix. 13, 14). "Lord," he said, "I have heard of this man, how much evil he hath done to the Saints at Jerusalem; and here he hath authority from the Chief Priests to bind all that call on Thy name." But his doubts were speedily dispelled; Saul, who was "before a blasphemer and injurious (*ὀβριστήν*), obtained mercy, because he did it ignorantly in unbelief" (1 Tim. i. 13); the Lord now told Ananias that he was "a chosen vessel (*σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς*) unto

Him to bear His Name before the Gentiles and the children of Israel."

Ananias found Saul, as the Lord had foretold in the vision, praying in the house of Judas, probably one of the very disciples whom he had started from Jerusalem to persecute. Putting his hands upon him, he said, "Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared to thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost. Immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales, and he received sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized."

Saul "was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision" (Acts xxvi. 19), but straightway preached Christ in the synagogues of Damascus that "He is the Son of God" (Acts ix. 20). The Jews were not unnaturally astounded at the change which had so suddenly come over him, but it cannot be doubted that they were much incensed also. His life was in danger, and (probably for that reason) he retired for a time into Arabia (Gal. i. 17), where no doubt he gave himself over to contemplation and repentance for the past, and sought by meditation and prayer assistance for the arduous work before him. We do not learn how long he remained in Arabia; probably no great length of time; the East was not destined then to be his sphere of work; so he returned to Damascus, where "he confounded the Jews, proving that this is very Christ" (Acts ix. 22. Between Acts ix. 20 and Acts ix. 22 we place the visit to Arabia).

A few words must be said as to the political circumstances of Damascus at this time. Herod Antipas, the Tetrarch of Galilee, had married the daughter of Aretas, King of Arabia, whom he afterwards deserted for Herodias, the daughter of his brother Aristobulus, and therefore his own niece, as well as wife of his brother Philip, who was still living. It was for this act and other evils of his life that Antipas was reproved by John the Baptist; a reproof which led to the Baptist's death. To avenge

the wrong done to his daughter, Aretas made war upon and defeated Antipas, and gained possession of Damascus; and the Jews, looking upon the defeat of Antipas as a just retribution for the murder of the Baptist, espoused the cause, and consequently gained the favour, of Aretas.

A conspiracy against Saul was now set on foot at Damascus, and whilst the Jews watched the gates day and night to kill him, the Ethnarch under Aretas helped them with a garrison, being desirous to apprehend him (2 Cor. xi. 32). The disciples, however, let him down the wall in a basket, and he was thus enabled to escape from the city. This event occurred three years after his conversion (Gal. i. 18); i.e. A.D. 37.

On leaving Damascus, Saul then, for the first time since his conversion, went to Jerusalem "to see (*ἱστορῆσαι*) Peter." The disciples, however, not having been informed of the change which had taken place, were afraid of him, till Barnabas, who, as already mentioned (p. 15), might have made his acquaintance at the school of Gamaliel, or perhaps in their own homes (Cyprus being only a few hours' sail from Cilicia), introduced him to the Apostles Peter and James, the Lord's brother (Gal. i. 19), the Bishop of Jerusalem; telling them "how he had preached boldly in Damascus in the name of Jesus." With Peter he abode fifteen days, and "was with him coming in and going out of Jerusalem." There "he spoke boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, and disputed against the Grecians (the Hellenistic Jews), who went about to slay him." But it was not appointed that Jerusalem should be the scene of his ministrations. Whilst one day praying in the Temple, he fell into a trance, and saw the Saviour and heard His voice, "Make haste and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem . . . for I will send thee far hence to the Gentiles." The brethren then took him to Cæsarea, and sent him on to Tarsus; as he himself says (Gal. i. 21), he went into the regions of Cilicia.

The conversion of Saul was followed by a period of rest for

the Churches, marked by an important event, the opening of the Church, which had hitherto been confined to the Jews and Samaritans, to the Gentiles also.

Soon after the cessation of the persecution that followed the death of St. Stephen, Peter travelled through Judæa and Samaria to Lydda, a place eighteen miles from Jerusalem, where he cured a man named Æneas of palsy, from which he had been confined to his bed eight years. From Lydda he went to Joppa (the modern Jaffa), where he restored to life a disciple whose Jewish name was Tabitha (meaning *beautiful*), in Greek Dorcas, "a woman full of good works which she did." Lydda was about nine miles from Joppa, and the effect of the two miracles was the conversion of many of the inhabitants of Lydda and Joppa, with one of whom, Simon a tanner, a resident of Joppa, he took up his abode for "many days" (*ἡμέρας ἱκανάς*, i.e. A.D. 38—41).

A strong barrier divided the Jews and Gentiles, the removal of which was a necessary preliminary to the conversion of the latter to Christianity. Oppression under a foreign yoke had produced in the Jews an obstinate attachment to their own, and a separation from, and fanatical hatred of, everything that was opposed to their religion. Despised and hated as the Jews were by all nations with whom they were brought into contact, Judaism, treated by the Romans with silent contempt, was tolerated as an ancient religion and allowed to exist. But the forbearance which was shown to themselves they were unwilling to extend to others; they avoided all intercourse with uncircumcised people as unclean; even to eat with whom or sit in their company was an unlawful thing.

The time had now arrived when this wall of partition was to be broken down, and the door of the Church opened to the Gentile world. But how was this to be effected? How was Peter to be convinced that through him and by means of his ministry the Gentiles were to be incorporated into the Church?

how were the existing conditions of social and religious life to be revolutionised? Nothing less than a direct interposition of Providence was employed to this end. About the sixth hour of the day, at a time when Peter was hungering for food, and his attendants were preparing it, he went to the house-top to pray; when, falling into a trance, he saw Heaven opened, and a vessel, or great sheet, let down upon the earth, "knit at the four corners" (*ἀρχαῖς*, beginnings)—the great sheet, says St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, is a fitting emblem of the Church, and the four corners the four quarters of the earth over which the Gospel is spread—containing an assemblage of clean and unclean animals, with the command to "kill and eat." This was thrice repeated before Peter's Jewish prejudices could be overcome; "Not so, Lord," he said, "for I have never eaten anything which is common or unclean;" and it required the Heavenly sanction to convince him. "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common."

Whilst he was doubting as to the meaning of the vision, three messengers sent by Cornelius, a member of one of the first families in Italy, a centurion of the Roman forces in Cæsarea, "a devout man and one that feared God with his whole house," and "of good report amongst all the nations of the Jews," arrived. Cornelius had himself also been admonished by an Angel in a vision to send to Joppa for the Apostle. But in order to remove any further prejudice, in case such still existed in the mind of Peter, the Spirit again told him to "arise and go with them, for I have sent them." Peter now understood what the vision meant; how that "God is no respecter of persons, but that in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him;" and that thenceforward there was to be no distinction between Jew and Gentile.

Leaving Joppa the next day with the messengers, and accompanied by certain of the brethren, he arrived at Cæsarea, where

he found Cornelius with his kinsmen and near friends awaiting him. Cornelius, observing a form of homage customary amongst Orientals, fell down at his feet and worshipped him ; the homage, however, was declined by Peter in the words, "Stand up, I also am a man." No longer bound by Jewish prejudice, Peter entered in and conversed with Cornelius and those in his house. He then preached to them of that Jesus Whom the Jews slew and God raised from the dead, Whom God commanded the Apostles to preach as the future Judge of quick and dead ; and that "whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins."

Whilst he was preaching, another effusion of the Holy Ghost occurred ; and another miraculous gift of tongues, as on the great Day of Pentecost, heralded the admission of the Gentiles into the Church. Peter could no longer doubt ; "Can any man forbid water," he said, "that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost, even as we?" To refuse them baptism, he said afterwards (Acts xi. 19), would be "to withstand God" (*καλῶσαι τὸν Θεόν*) ; and though he did not baptize them himself, "he commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord." Thus Cornelius and his house became the first-fruits of the Gentile Church, and St. Peter, to whom our Lord had given the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, was the instrument of opening the gates of the Church to the Gentiles, as he had before opened them to the Jews on the Day of Pentecost. "Men and brethren," he said afterwards (Acts xv. 7), "ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles through my mouth should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe."

When Peter returned to Jerusalem, he found much dissatisfaction prevailing amongst those of the Circumcision that he had gone "in to men uncircumcised," and had eaten with them. But after he explained the circumstances, and how that God had given the same gift of the Holy Spirit to the Gentiles as He had before given to the Jews, they glorified God

that He had "also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life."

Meanwhile the Gospel had been spreading beyond the limits of Jerusalem and Cæsarea. On the dispersion which followed the martyrdom of St. Stephen, some disciples travelled, not only, as the Deacon Philip, to Phenice, but to Cyprus, and Antioch (a city about three hundred miles from Jerusalem), preaching the Word, but to the Jews only, of whom a great number believed and turned to the Lord. Some of these, however, men of Cyprus and Cyrene, preached also to the Grecians ('Ελληνιστάς, probably Proselytes of the Gate) "the Lord Jesus . . . and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord."

When tidings of this success at Antioch reached the Church in Jerusalem, they sent thither Barnabas, a fellow-countryman of the Cypriot missionaries, and through him "much people was added unto the Lord." Whereupon Barnabas, needing further assistance in his work, went to Tarsus, whither Saul, whose mission to the Gentiles had been sanctioned by the Saviour Himself (Acts ix. 15), had been sent by the Disciples (Acts ix. 30), and brought him to Antioch. At Antioch the two continued to preach for a whole year; and "the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch" (A.D. 43), the converts at Jerusalem continuing, probably, to be called Nazarenes and Galilæans.

From Antioch Barnabas and Saul were sent to Jerusalem to the Elders or Presbyters (a name afterwards shortened into *Priests*—this is the first mention made in the Acts of the Apostles of the second Order in the Ministry—) to convey the contributions from the Christian community at Antioch for their poorer brethren in Jerusalem, in view of the famine which Agabus had predicted should prevail over the whole Roman world (ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην), and which came to pass in the reign of the Emperor Claudius.

Antioch, the residence of the Roman Presidents of Syria, ranking, next to Rome and Alexandria, as the third greatest city

in the world, thenceforwards holds throughout the Acts of the Apostles at least as important a place as Jerusalem, in the history of the Church. It became to the heathen converts what Jerusalem was to the Jewish converts of Judæa, Galilee, and Samaria, the centre of Gentile Christianity.

About the time that the messengers from Antioch arrived at Jerusalem a terrible calamity visited the Church in the death of the first Apostle who fell a Martyr to the faith. On the death of Tiberius (A.D. 37), Caligula became Emperor, and to him succeeded Claudius (41—54). Herod Agrippa I. ("the King," Acts xii. 1), the son of Aristobulus, grandson of Herod the Great, and brother of Herodias (Matt. xiv. 6, Mark vi. 17, Luke iii. 19), had been thrown into prison by Tiberius, but had the good fortune of obliging Caligula, who conferred on him the North-Eastern Tetrarchy, which had been vacant since the death of his uncle Philip (A.D. 34). Herodias envying her brother the title of King, persuaded Antipas her husband (if he can be so called), to solicit from Caligula the same dignity. But Agrippa having prejudiced the Emperor against him, he, with Herodias, was banished to Lyons, in Gaul, and his territory conferred on Agrippa. Agrippa had again the good fortune of materially assisting Claudius in obtaining the Empire, and was rewarded by him with the dominion of Judæa, Samaria, and Idumea, with the title of King over all his dominions, so that they were now equal in extent to those formerly possessed by Herod the Great.

Personally popular with the Jews, he was a violent persecutor of the Christians, and A.D. 44, "stretched forth his hand to vex certain of the Church, and killed James (the son of Zebedee), the brother of John, with the sword." Thus did James fulfil the prophecy of the Lord, that he "should drink of His cup, and be baptized with the Baptism with which He was baptized" (Matt. xx. 23). Finding that the act pleased the Jews, he proceeded to take Peter also, and threw him into prison, committing him to four quaternions of soldiers, one quaternion for

each of the four watches of the night, and intending after Easter to deliver him to the people. But Peter's time was not yet come. He was sleeping between two soldiers of the quaternion of the watch, bound to them by two chains, whilst the two other soldiers watched the prison door, when, in answer to the prayers of the Church, the Angel of the Lord "smote him in the side," and a light shone in the prison, and his chains fell off. The Angel then led him through the two wards; the iron gate of the prison opened of its own accord; and the Angel having conducted him safely into the street of the city, then left him. Peter proceeded at once to the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark the Evangelist, the nephew of Barnabas; and after having related to them how the Lord had delivered him out of prison, and given instructions that they should inform James, the Bishop, he, as the means of escaping the vengeance of Herod, left Jerusalem, and took up his residence in Cæsarea. Herod ordered the keepers of the prison to be put to death (*ἀπαχέηναι, to be led forth*); but his own end was at hand; he was smitten by the Angel of the Lord with a loathsome disease, of which he died. On his death the persecution of the Church ceased.

After the death of Herod, Barnabas and Saul returned to Antioch from Jerusalem, accompanied by John Mark. At Antioch, the leaders of the Church, the "prophets and teachers," were instructed by the Holy Ghost, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Evodius was probably Bishop of Antioch at this time, but we are not told whether he took part in the Consecration, but only that it was effected by imposition of hands, after fasting and prayer. Up to this time Barnabas and Saul were amongst the prophets and teachers (Acts xiii. 1); thenceforward they are called Apostles (Acts xiv. 14), and placed on an equality with the other Apostles, so that St. Paul could say of himself that he was "not a whit behind the chiefest of the Apostles" (2 Cor.

xi. 5) ; and the Church of England, in her Office for the Consecration of Bishops, recognizes this act at Antioch as the Ordination of SS. Paul and Barnabas.

More than the twelve years, during which it is supposed our Saviour had bidden the Apostles to remain in Jerusalem, having now expired, they all probably, with the exception of St. James the Bishop, departed on their several missions. Thenceforward their history is veiled in much obscurity, and the Acts of the Apostles is almost entirely confined to the history of Saul, who, accompanied by Barnabas and Mark, now (A.D. 45) started on his first Apostolical journey. We must presume that an acquaintance with the Acts of the Apostles is familiar to Church people, and that it is only necessary to touch upon the leading events in St. Paul's history, and to connect what is told us in the Acts and in St. Paul's own Epistles.

St. Paul's First Missionary Journey. Sent forth by the Holy Spirit, the three missionaries now proceeded to Seleucia, where they took ship and crossed to Cyprus, the birth-place of Barnabas. From Salamis they passed to Paphos, the capital of the Island, where the first recorded convert was the Deputy (ἀνθύπατος) Sergius Paulus, who, after having witnessed the judicial blindness inflicted on the sorcerer Elymas for seeking to restrain him from the truth, "believed, being astonished at the doctrine of the Lord." About this time Saul assumed the name of Paul. St. Luke simply mentions the change immediately after the conversion of Sergius Paulus, without comment ; "Saul, who also is called Paul." (Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος.) It was not unusual with those Jews who resided amongst the heathen to assume the Gentile equivalent of their own name ; it is scarcely to be supposed that Saul would have taken the name of his convert ; there would be more reason in a convert assuming the name of his teacher. It is not unreasonable to suppose that he exchanged the Hebrew name into the Roman and Greek form

either at his Ordination, or on entering on his mission amongst the Gentiles.

Loosing from Paphos, they arrived at Perga in Pamphylia. Here Mark left them to return to his own home in Jerusalem. The reason for his so doing is not recorded; he had put his hand to the plough, and for a time looked back; his after-life showed that he was not a renegade; but for the present it was regarded with disfavour by Paul, and led to a serious misunderstanding in the future.

The next scene of their labours was Antioch in Pisidia, a place not to be confounded with Antioch in Syria. Although he was the Apostle of the Gentiles, Paul made it a rule (as far as possible) to preach first in the Synagogues of the Jews. On the first Sabbath-day the Jews listened attentively so long as he spoke to them of the promised Messiah. But when on the following Sabbath the Synagogue was crowded by the whole city, not by Jews only but Gentiles also, Jewish bigotry was aroused; "they spoke against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming." The Apostles, seeing where their path of duty led, then turned to the Gentiles, who gladly received the Word of God. It was necessary, they told the Jews, that the Word of God should be preached to them, but "seeing that ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, we turn unto the Gentiles." Thereupon the Jews "raised a persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled them out of their coasts," the Apostles shaking off the dust from their feet.

A similar persecution followed in Iconium, the capital of Lycaonia. Here the unbelieving Jews, with their rulers, stirred up the Gentiles against them; the whole city was divided into two parties, the one holding with the Jews, the other with the Apostles, who hearing that a conspiracy had been formed both by Jews and Gentiles to kill them, fled from the city and

preached the Gospel in Derbe and Lystra, and the neighbouring districts of Lycaonia.

At Lystra the Apostles were, for the first time, brought in contact with a thoroughly Pagan population. In consequence of the miraculous cure of a man who was a cripple from his birth, the people were with difficulty restrained from offering sacrifice to them, as to their own gods, Jupiter and Mercury. No sooner, however, was this illusion dispelled by some Jews who arrived from Antioch and Iconium, than they went to the other extreme, and stoned Paul and dragged him out of the city, supposing that he was dead. "Once was I stoned," says St. Paul (2 Cor. xi. 25), in allusion to this event.

On the next day, Paul was sufficiently recovered to depart with Barnabas for Derbe, where they made many disciples (*μυθητεύσαντες ἱκανούς*) without apparently meeting with persecution). They again returned to Lystra and Iconium, confirming the disciples in every city, and ordaining Presbyters in every Church—this is the first mention made of the Ordination of Presbyters or Priests. Passing through Pisidia to Pamphylia, and preaching in Perga, they took ship in Attalia on the coast of Pamphylia, and ended their journey at Antioch after an absence of two years. At Antioch, having rehearsed to the assembled Church all that God had done by them, and the acceptance of the faith by the Gentiles, "they abode a long time with the disciples."

The question not unnaturally arose how far the Gentile converts were bound to the Mosaic Law and the rite of Circumcision. A two-fold danger from Judaism harassed the Church, one external, from its professed enemies of the Sanhedrim and the Synagogue, the other internal, from its Jewish converts who were over-zealous for the Law of Moses. These latter were probably countenanced by SS. James and Peter, whilst St. Paul was an advocate for perfect liberty. Certain Judaizers (St. Paul calls them "false brethren," Gal. ii. 4),

“unawares brought in to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus,” came from Judæa to Antioch, men who had acquiesced in the conversion of the Gentiles, and had conceded thus much to St. Peter after the conversion of Cornelius. But they beheld with indignation the supercession by these new converts of the external rites of Judaism, and maintained that “unless they were circumcised after the law of Moses, they cannot be saved.”

And yet such a claim was at variance with the custom of the Jews themselves with regard to their own converts from the heathen. Only a few of these converts were willing to submit to Circumcision, those who did so being distinguished as *Proselytes of Righteousness*; i.e. right and complete Proselytes. Others, especially women, who were attracted to Judaism by a preference of the worship of One God to the Polytheism of the Pagans, objected to many of the external forms of the Mosaic Law; these were called *Proselytes of the Gate*, and were allowed to sojourn in Jerusalem on condition of their observing certain prescribed laws.

The question now raised by these Judaizing brethren struck at the very root of Christianity, the object of which was to reconcile and not divide. And it particularly affected St. Paul's mission and the great doctrine which he insisted upon, viz., Justification through faith in Christ, without the works of the Mosaic Law. After Paul and Barnabas had no small disputation with them, it was decided that they, with certain others, one of whom was Titus (Gal. ii. 1), an uncircumcised Greek (of whom mention is now made in the Epistles for the first time, and of whom it is remarkable that no mention is anywhere made in the Acts of the Apostles), should go to Jerusalem to take counsel with such of the Apostles as were there, and with the Presbyters, on the controversy. This decision, which was arrived at by the Christians at Antioch, was confirmed by a revelation made to St. Paul from Heaven (Gal. ii. 2).

The question was considered of such importance as to require the assembling a Council of the whole Church at Jerusalem, which met, A.D. 50, under the presidency of James the Bishop. Peter, who spoke first, insisted on the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ as sufficient for salvation. Paul and Barnabas next declared the miracles and wonders that God had wrought amongst the Gentiles through them. James then summed up the whole case, and, though himself a strict adherent of the Jewish rites, gave sentence that the Gentile converts should not be trammelled with the observance of the Mosaic Law further than was necessary in the cause of peace between the two parties. A compromise in the spirit of Christian charity was effected; whilst the Gentiles were not to be troubled with any unnecessary burdens, they were bound to observe a respect for Jewish susceptibilities, and to abstain from such things as might be a stumbling-block to weak brethren. Thus the cause advocated by Paul received the sanction of the Church; in other words, the Gentile converts were admitted to the privileges of Proselytes of the Gate.

St. John, as well as SS. James and Peter, was present at the Council, and this is the only meeting between SS. John and Paul recorded in the Bible. James, Peter, and John, St. Paul says (Gal. ii. 9), "who seemed to be pillars," gave to him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship (thereby publicly acknowledging him as the Apostle of the Gentiles), that he and Barnabas should go to the heathen, as they themselves did to the Circumcision.

It will have been observed that Peter claimed no pre-eminence in this, the first, Council of the Church; he neither convened it nor presided at it; he guided it, and James adopted his argument.

Letters were despatched through Paul and Barnabas, with whom were associated Judas, surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, "chief men among the brethren," to the Gentile brethren in Syria and Cilicia, with the decree of the Council. "It seemed

good," it enacted, "to the Holy Ghost and to us," that they abstain from meats which had been polluted by being offered in sacrifice to idols, and from the flesh of animals which had been strangled, and which contained blood ;—and a moral prohibition is added—"from fornication." (St. John, Rev. ii. 14, combines the eating of things sacrificed to idols and fornication, as the sin which Balaam taught Balak, to cast as a stumbling-block before the children of Israel.)

The presence of St. Peter at the Council of Jerusalem is the last mention made of him in the Acts of the Apostles. In the interval between the Council and St. Paul's departure on his second missionary journey, St. Peter probably paid the visit to Antioch of which we read in the Epistle to the Galatians (ii. 11—13). It appears that notwithstanding the decree of the Council of Jerusalem, there remained a strong feeling on the part of the Jewish community against their Gentile brethren in the faith. Peter had been in the habit of associating in friendly intercourse, and never scrupled to eat, with the Gentiles, who formed the larger part of the Christians at Antioch, till certain brethren of the Circumcision coming from James (i.e. from Jerusalem) complained, in their Jewish bigotry, of his so doing. Whereupon Peter, notwithstanding the revelation made to him at Joppa, and acting against the spirit of the Council of Jerusalem, with characteristic weakness, withdrew, and separated himself, "fearing them which were of the Circumcision" (Gal. ii. 12). Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. St. Paul, who took the lead of the Gentiles in their head-quarters at Antioch, being naturally aggrieved, "withstood Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed," and rebuked him openly; "If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, why compellest thou the Gentiles to do as the Jews?" . . . for "a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ." St. Paul's own practice is summed up in the Epistle to the Corinthians (1. vii, 18, 19); "Is any man called being cir-

cumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any man called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised. Circumcision is nothing, and Uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God?" It is to the works of the Mosaic Law St. Paul refers when he says we are "justified by faith and not by works." Such passages which are to be found in his Epistle have nothing to do with modern controversies relative to the bearing of faith and works; for, he says, "if righteousness come by the Law (i.e. by Circumcision), then Christ died in vain."

St. Paul's Second Missionary Journey. We are not told how long a period intervened between the end of St. Paul's first, and the commencement of his second, journey. After preaching some time at Antioch, he proposed to Barnabas that they should revisit all the churches which they had founded during their first journey. But now a difficulty arose. Barnabas was unwilling to undertake the journey unless they were accompanied by his nephew Mark; but to this St. Paul objected on account of Mark's desertion of them on their first journey. It may also be the case that Mark's relationship with Barnabas had induced him to adopt the same line of conduct which St. Paul had censured in the case of St. Peter. Neither of them was willing to give way; and the contention (*παροξυσμός*) was so sharp between them that they parted. The estrangement of the two great missionaries was a severe trial to the Church; but as a proof that there was no permanent ill-feeling created between them, it is only necessary to refer to 2 Tim. iv. 11, and Col. iv. 10; whilst of St. Barnabas, as being active in their Master's service, St. Paul makes mention (1 Cor. ix. 6). It is probable that an amicable arrangement was arrived at, and that they divided their missionary labours between them; Barnabas (this is the last mention made of him in the Acts of the Apostles) taking with him Mark, revisited his native Cyprus; whilst Paul, in company of Silas or Silvanus,

who had probably remained at Antioch after the council, proceeded to Syria and Cilicia.

At Lystra they met Timothy, who is called a *disciple* (probably he had been baptized by St. Paul on his first visit to Lystra); of whom he wrote afterwards (Phil. ii. 22), that "as a son with the father he served with him in the Gospel." His father was a Greek, and his own name (Τιμόθεος) is also Greek; but his grandmother Lois and his mother Eunice were Jewesses (2 Tim. i. 5), and by them Timothy had from his childhood been instructed in the Holy Scriptures. The different dealings of St. Paul in the cases of Timothy and Titus exemplify his practice in the abstract question of Circumcision and Uncircumcision, how in such matters he was all things to all men, that he "might by all means save some." Whilst the Gentiles viewed, like himself, such matters with indifference, St. Paul felt that for the conversion of the Jews the Circumcision of Timothy was indispensable; him therefore "he took and circumcised because of the Jews which were in those quarters;" but Titus being a Greek was not compelled to be circumcised (Gal. ii. 3).

After having founded Churches in Phrygia and Galatia, and passing by Mysia, they came to Troas, where they were joined by St. Luke the Evangelist, "the beloved physician," who afterwards wrote, in the Acts of the Apostles, the history of the mission. It has been suggested (Conybeare and Howson) that St. Luke joined them in the capacity of physician, for, as we learn (Gal. iv. 13), St. Paul was suffering at the time from a recent illness. At Troas, Paul being admonished in a dream, which he ascribed to a call from God, to leave Asia and to cross over to Macedonia, they took ship, and landing at the harbour of Neapolis, proceeded to Philippi, the chief city of the country, and a Roman colony, where they passed several days.

Having there converted and baptized a Jewish Proselyte (σεβομένη τὸν Θεόν) named Lydia, from Thyatira in Asia Minor, a dealer in purple, who had come to Philippi to sell her goods,

together with her household (probably the attendants who assisted her in her trade), Paul next "in the Name of the Lord Jesus" cast out "a spirit of divination" from a damsel who had brought much gain "by soothsaying" to her employers. Her masters, finding that they were deprived of their means of gain, stirred up the multitude, and Paul and Silas were accused before the magistrates, not with having depreciated their former profits derived from exorcism (which was illegal), but with being Jews, a sect at that time particularly hateful, and troubling the city by teaching customs which it was unlawful for the Romans to receive. They were accordingly, after being severely scourged, committed to prison, the jailor who had charge of them thrusting them into the inner prison, and securing their feet in the stocks. But at midnight, whilst they were engaged in prayer and singing praises to God, sounds of cheerfulness unusual in a Roman dungeon, the prisoners were listening (*ἐπηκροῶντο*); when suddenly, as if in answer to their prayers, the foundations were shaken by an earthquake, the doors of the prison flew open, the prisoners' chains were loosed, and the frightened jailor, fearing his two prisoners had escaped, in which case certain death would be his punishment, drew his sword, and was on the point of destroying himself. The "loud voice" of Paul, "do thyself no harm, for we are all here," at once reassured him. But a higher feeling took possession of him; frightened and astonished, persuaded by all the surrounding circumstances of the presence of a mightier power, he fell down before them, and brought them out, and with an awakened conscience demanded, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" "Believe," they told him, "on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house." In the same hour of the night the jailor took them and washed their wounds, "and was baptized, he and all his straightway."

The magistrates had either themselves felt, or had been informed of, the earthquake and of the events which had taken

place in the prison. When the morning came they sent their lictors (*ῥαβδούχους*) with the order, "Let these men go." But the magistrates had violated the law; they had scourged and imprisoned without a trial two Roman citizens; the violation of the law had been public, the assertion of the innocence of the prisoners must be public also. "Let them come themselves and fetch us out." The magistrates, knowing that this treatment of two Roman citizens, if divulged in Rome, would subject them to punishment, readily accepted the terms; they came and brought their prisoners out, and desired them to depart out of the city.

Such, as far as can be learnt for certain, is the history of the introduction of Christianity into Europe, and this is the first historical announcement made of any of the Apostles preaching in Europe.

Paul and Silas, having proceeded from the prison to the house of Lydia, travelled next through Amphipolis and Apollonia to Thessalonica, about twenty miles distant, leaving at Philippi Luke and Timothy, with the former of whom we do not again meet till after St. Paul's second visit to Macedonia (Acts xx. 5).

At Thessalonica there was a Synagogue, in which Paul, on three successive Sabbaths, reasoned with the Jews, proving from the Scriptures that Christ Whom they had crucified and Who rose from the dead was the Messiah foretold by their own Prophets. Some who heard him believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas; and a great multitude "of the devout Greeks" (that is the Proselytes) "and of the chief women not a few" embraced the Gospel. But to the majority of the Jews, who still expected a Messiah who would set up an earthly kingdom and deliver them from bondage to the Romans, the idea of a suffering Messiah was repugnant. Moved with envy at the success of the Apostles' teaching, they gathered together a lawless mob and attacked the house of Jason, with whom probably Paul and Silas were lodging; but being unable to find them,

they vented their wrath upon Jason himself, whom, with certain of the brethren, they took before the rulers of the city (*πολιτάρχας*), accusing them with acting "contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying that there is another King, one Jesus." Such a charge would place the magistrates in a difficulty; they would not like to offend the Romans, nor on the other hand to involve themselves in a dispute between Jews and Christians; so they adopted a middle course; having "taken security of Jason and of the others, they let them go."

But notwithstanding the opposition of the Jews, the labours of Paul and Silas amongst the Thessalonians met with much success. Though St. Paul wrote to them afterwards of their having "received the Word in much affliction" (1 Thess. i. 6), yet he was also enabled to say (1 Thess. ii. 1), "yourselves know our entrance in unto you, that it was not in vain." How long they remained in Thessalonica we are not told, but probably for a longer period than the three Sabbaths in which he preached in their synagogues, for he mentions his following there the trade which he had learnt in his youth, "labouring night and day that we would not be chargeable to any of you" (1 Thess. ii. 9).

Their position, however, had been so insecure that "the brethren sent them away by night to Beræa, a city sixty miles distant, where the Jews, we are told, were more noble than those of Thessalonica. They searched the Scriptures for themselves to see whether the Gospel preached to them were true, and made them their daily study, so that the teaching of Paul and Silas was blessed by the conversion of many not of the Jews only, but of men and women of honourable birth amongst the Greeks. But Jews coming from Thessalonica stirred up the Beræans against them, so that as the brethren considered Paul's longer residence there unsafe, he left Beræa for Athens, Silas and Timothy (the latter of whom had rejoined him from Philippi), continuing there still. From Athens he sent instructions

to Timothy to proceed to Thessalonica "to establish them and comfort them in their faith" (1 Thess. iii. 2); after which both he and Silas were to join him with all speed at Athens, (Acts xvii. 15).

Athens, the most cultivated and philosophical city of Greece, was outwardly devoted to religion, but to a religion at the best of sentiment and intellect, thoroughly worthless and destitute of moral power, and of the true knowledge of God. On all sides objects of devotion, temples and statues and altars of the gods, met the eye; the city was "wholly given to idolatry." Always seeking to hear or learn something new, the people were living in complete ignorance of God, an ignorance which they themselves acknowledged by an inscription on their altars, *To the Unknown God*. Whom they ignorantly worshipped, Him St. Paul now came to declare unto them.

Moved with indignation at the sight before him, he first addressed himself, according to his usual custom, to his own brethren of the house of Israel, disputing in the synagogues with the Jewish proselytes, as well as in the Agora or market-place, the common centre of public life, of learning and idleness, of business and pleasure, with those he met there. The two philosophical schools which he encountered were those of the Epicureans and Stoics, which were totally opposed to Christianity, the former being Atheists, the latter Pantheists, both denying the Resurrection from the dead and a future judgment, in the sense in which the Gospel has revealed them. Paul, a native of Tarsus, third only to Athens and Alexandria as a famous city of philosophers, was admirably fitted to cope with them. Desirous of learning what this "babbler" (σπερμολόγος) had to say, they led him from the bustle of the Agora to the Areopagus, the seat of their Council in the centre of the city, as a place best adapted for a religious disputation. "May we know," they asked him, "what this new doctrine is?"

Standing in the midst of Mars' Hill (whether on his trial or

not St. Luke does not say), he declared unto them the "unknown God" whom they ignorantly worshipped. He spoke of the Divine Creator of the world, against their theory that the world came by chance; of His omnipresence, against those of them who undermined the Providence of God; he told them how He made all nations of the earth of one blood, against their assumption of a different origin between Greeks and those whom they called barbarians; of the spirituality of the Godhead, and Its unlikeness to the heathen worship of "gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device." He concluded with a call to repentance, and warned them of a day which God had appointed for judgment, "by that Man whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance unto all men" by the Resurrection of the Saviour.

On hearing of the Resurrection, some ridiculed, others were indifferent; "we will hear thee again," they said, "of this matter." A few, however, believed, amongst whom were Dionysius, a member of the court of Areopagus, to whom tradition assigns (and such an appointment would be consistent with St. Paul's practice) the Bishopric of Athens, and a woman named Damaris, who, St. Chrysostom states, was the wife of Dionysius; and some others.

How long St. Paul remained at Athens, and whether he ever visited the city again, we are not told. He does not appear to have been driven away by a tumult; he left Athens apparently by his own will, and went thence to Corinth.

At Corinth, the populous and mercantile Metropolis of Achaia, he found a zealous assistant in Aquila, who with his wife Priscilla, both of whom were natives of Pontus, had been obliged to leave Rome in consequence of a decree of the Emperor Claudius, ordering all Jews to depart from Rome. The reason of this is attributed by a Roman writer, Suetonius, who flourished at the end of the first century, to incessant tumults raised by a Jew named Chrestus ("Judæos, impulsore Chresto, assidue tumultu-

antes, Româ expulit"). This may be literally true, but it has been generally understood to refer to riots fomented by the Jews against the Christians. Whether Aquila and Priscilla were Christians when St. Paul first met them must be left doubtful; they might have heard of the Gospel from the "strangers of Rome," who, returning home, might perhaps have introduced the Gospel there, after the Day of Pentecost. Or, as is perhaps probable, they were converted at Corinth by St. Paul; like him, they were tent-makers, and for this reason Paul took up his residence with them, supporting himself by his trade.

At Corinth he was joined by Timothy, and Silas, who arrived from Beræa, and with their aid (2 Cor. i. 19) he set himself to overcome the opposition which he encountered from the Jews. He tells the Corinthians (1 Cor. ii. 3) that he "was with them in fear and in much trembling;" but he is able to tell them afterwards (2 Cor. vii. 6) that "God, who comforteth those who are cast down, comforted him by the coming of Titus." The opposition and blasphemy he met with from the Jews at Corinth was so violent that, shaking off the dust from his garment, and proclaiming himself innocent of their blood, he told them that thenceforward he would go to the Gentiles. But the Jews brought him before Gallio (the younger brother of the famous Seneca, and uncle of the poet Lucan), who had lately been appointed Proconsul of Achaia, on the charge of persuading men to "worship God contrary to the Law." Gallio, however, was favourably inclined to Paul; at any rate he was little inclined to interfere in questions touching the Jewish law, and, without waiting to hear Paul's defence, drove them from his judgment-seat. Thereupon the bystanders (who were probably Greeks), relying upon the favour of Gallio, took the law into their own hands, and beat Sosthenes, the Ruler of the Synagogue, before the very judgment seat; still Gallio "cared for none of these things," and continued to treat the matter with indifference. After he was driven out of the Synagogue by the Jews, Paul repaired to the house of a

Proselyte named Justus, which adjoined the Synagogue. Here he was encouraged by a vision, and told that no man should hurt him, and that God had much people in the city.

The treatment by Gallio of the persecuting Jews greatly aided the work of Paul, and in Corinth a flourishing Church arose. Many profligates were rescued from their sin (1 Cor. vii. 11); whilst amongst the principal converts were Stephanas (the first-fruits of Achaia, as St. Paul calls him, 1 Cor. xvi. 15), whom he himself baptized with his own hands (1 Cor. i. 16); and Crispus (1 Cor. i. 14), and it is probable Sosthenes also, whom he calls his own brother (1 Cor. i. 1), both of them chief rulers of the Synagogue; and Gaius (1 Cor. i. 14), who was his host (Rom. xvi. 23) on his second visit to Corinth, as Aquila and Priscilla were on this visit.

At Corinth he remained a year and a half. News brought by Timothy from the Church at Thessalonica induced him to write during his residence at Corinth, the first in date of his Epistles, the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, to which he added, also from Corinth, the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians.

Paul now determined to leave Achaia in order to be present at the approaching Festival, probably that of Pentecost, at Jerusalem; and taking leave of the brethren, he embarked at Cenchreæ, the harbour of Corinth. We are told of his having "shorn his head" at Cenchreæ in fulfilment of a vow. Neither as to the reason of his making the vow, nor as to its nature (for there is no reason for supposing it to have been the Nazarite vow), have we any information; but as to the former we may hazard a conjecture. He perhaps made it in accordance with a custom of the Jews when they were involved in some trouble; it may be during the illness from which he had been lately suffering. So long as he was in Greece, and amongst Gentile Christians, he hesitated in its performance, as it would have exposed him to ridicule, it being the custom amongst the Greeks for slaves only to wear their hair short. But now that he was

about to leave Greece and to embark for the East, where he would come in contact with Jewish Christians, amongst whom the fulfilment of the vow would be a matter of importance, he thought fit to delay it no longer. And he had an especial reason at this time for a strict observance of the Mosaic Law. The Jews (as we learn, Acts xxi. 21) had lately accused him of teaching the Gentiles not to circumcise their children, nor to observe the Jewish customs. The charge was unjust, for it was his rule, whilst claiming perfect liberty to the Gentiles, to be himself "as under the law to those who are under the law." (1 Cor. x. 20.) It was now, therefore, out of respect for Jewish scruples that he fulfilled his vow, and in like manner we shall find him, when he arrives at Jerusalem, joining himself to four other men who were under a similar vow.

Setting sail from Cenchreæ, he touched at Ephesus, as far as which city Aquila and Priscilla had accompanied him. The Jews at Ephesus requested him to prolong his stay amongst them, but pleading the necessity of his immediate departure in order to arrive in time for the Feast in Jerusalem, he promised to pay them another visit, "if God will;" so leaving there Aquila and Priscilla, he sailed away, and landing at Cæsarea, went up and saluted the Church at Jerusalem. This is all we are told of this visit in the Acts of the Apostles; whether or not he was in time for the Feast we are nowhere informed; he speedily went on to Antioch, where he completed his Second Apostolical journey in the summer of A.D. 54, after an absence of two years.

St. Paul's Third Missionary Journey. The principal scene of the third Apostolic journey, which Paul commenced at the end of A.D. 54, and in which he was probably accompanied by Timothy, was Ephesus, which thenceforward became a centre of Christianity in Asia, and was added to those already existing at Jerusalem, Antioch, Thessalonica, and Corinth.

Quitting Antioch and passing through Galatia and Phrygia, he

strengthened all the Churches in those parts. At Galatia he carried out an object which he constantly had at heart, and which had been imposed upon him by the Council of Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 10), "to remember the poor." With a view to this he gave instructions for a systematic collection of the alms of the Church to be made on the first day of the week, according to the means with which God had blessed them, to be sent, as opportunity occurred, to Jerusalem (1 Cor. xvi. 1—3).

He then paid his promised visit to Ephesus. Whether or not he found Aquila and Priscilla still residing there, we are not told; but since he left them they had not been idle. Certain disciples, Apollos and twelve others, had, during his absence, arrived there, who had received only the Baptism of John, the Baptism of Repentance. They expected, indeed, that a greater than John should come, but they did not realize that He had already come; they were ignorant of the full meaning of the Death and Resurrection of the Saviour, and of the remission of sins conferred by Christian Baptism.

Chief among them was Apollos, a Jew born at Alexandria, who had a high reputation for eloquence (*ἀνὴρ λόγιος*) and knowledge of the Scriptures. Being well "instructed in the way of the Lord" (*κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ Κυρίου*), "fervent in the Spirit," he spoke diligently and boldly, although with defective teaching, in the Synagogue of the Jews. Him Aquila and Priscilla "took unto them and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly." Apollos then went to Corinth, bearing commendatory letters from the Christians at Ephesus; he there "watered," where St. Paul had already planted, the Gospel (1 Cor. iii. 6); and God gave an abundant increase, for he mightily convinced those Jews who had before opposed Paul and blasphemed, proving "by the Scriptures that Jesus is Christ." St. Paul recognised the importance of his work and called him (1 Cor. xvi. 12) "our brother Apollos." But unfortunately, and unintentionally on the part of Apollos, a party spirit was en-

gendered amongst the Corinthians (1 Cor. i. 12); and St. Paul found it necessary to rebuke their strifes and divisions, and to remind them that there is only one foundation, which is Christ; that neither he that planted nor he that watered is anything, but only God who gave the increase.

It was during the absence of Apollos at Corinth that Paul arrived, on this second visit, at Ephesus, and he at once explained to the disciples of Apollos the initiatory character of St. John's Baptism. They thereupon received Baptism in the name of Jesus, and after the laying on of the hands of St. Paul, "the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied."

For the space of three months Paul spoke boldly in the Synagogue at Ephesus. But as the hearts of many of the Jews were hardened, and they spoke evil of the Gospel before the people, he separated himself from them, and for two years longer preached daily, not only in the school of one Tyrannus (Acts xix. 9), but also from house to house (Acts xx. 20), preaching repentance and faith both to the Jews and Greeks.

From Ephesus he wrote his First Epistle to the Corinthians. He remained there, according to St. Luke, two years and three months; but he himself told the Ephesians (Acts xx. 31) that "for the space of three years he feared not to warn every one of them night and day with tears." This was from A.D. 54—57. The difference is not difficult of explanation. St. Luke says (Acts xix. 10) that at this time "all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks." We may conclude, therefore, that, as he had before created Corinth as the mother-Church for Greece, he now made Ephesus the centre for establishing Churches in Asia; and that he devoted some portion of the three years to planting the Church in the interior of the country. In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, which he wrote at, or shortly after leaving, Ephesus, he says (2 Cor. xi. 25), "Thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day

I have been in the deep." It was then, perhaps, at this time that he visited Crete and founded the Church there, leaving Titus as its Bishop (Tit. i. 5); such a journey would have necessitated his being one day and night at sea, and might have been one of the occasions to which he alludes as having suffered shipwreck. From Ephesus he sent Timothy and Erastus to Macedonia, with instructions to the former to proceed afterwards to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17), he himself remaining at Ephesus.

Ephesus was renowned throughout the world for the worship of Diana, and the practice of magic. But Paul worked special miracles (*δυνάμεις οὐ τὰς τυχοῦσας*), and preached so successfully, that "the Word of the Lord mightily grew and prevailed," so that the worship of Diana, and the craft of the workmen who made silver shrines for her temple, was "in danger of being set at nought." A riot was the consequence, chief amongst the rioters being Demetrius; the cry of "Great is Diana of the Ephesians" resounded on all sides, and the riot was only appeased by the Town-Clerk (*ὁ γραμματεὺς*), who assured them that their uproar exposed the city to the displeasure of the Romans. So St. Paul left Ephesus, having at this time (as some suppose) appointed Timothy as Bishop of the See.

From Ephesus he made his way by slow stages and a circuitous route to Jerusalem, with the double intention of attending the Feast of Pentecost, and communicating to St. James and the Presbyters the result of his mission. Few important incidents marked the voyage.

From Ephesus he crossed to Macedonia, and all that St. Luke informs us of this event is comprised in a few lines; "He departed to go into Macedonia," and "when he had gone over those parts, and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece." "There he abode three months;" and from Corinth at this time wrote his Epistle to the Romans, which he sent by Phœbe (Rom. xvi. 1), a Deaconess of the Church at Cenchreæ, in which he announces his intention of visiting them

on his road from Jerusalem to Spain. At Rome, owing to the intercourse which existed between the capital and its provinces, a Church may have been formed by Christians from the East, or perhaps by the "strangers of Rome" returning home after the Day of Pentecost.

Probably about the same time also he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians, for his language (Gal. iv. 3) seems to imply that it was written after a second visit to Ephesus, and also soon after it. Information had reached him that his converts in that city, whom he regarded with peculiar affection, had been seduced by Judaizing missionaries, and abandoning his teaching, had submitted to Circumcision (Gal. vi. 13); and he marvels that they were *so soon* alienated from the faith which he had taught them (Gal. i. 6).

From Corinth (after passing some time at Philippi, where he was joined by St. Luke), he crossed into Asia, and coming to Troas (Acts xx. 5), he was much disappointed at not finding Titus (2 Cor. ii. 13); so he again "went from thence into Macedonia" (*ib.*), where he was comforted by the arrival of his long-expected friend (2 Cor. vii. 6). On his return from Europe on his way to Jerusalem he again went to Troas, and stopped there seven days. On the first day of the week (the vessel being about to sail on the morrow), whilst he was preaching at midnight, a young man named Eutyches, overcome by exhaustion and slumber, fell down from the balcony on which he was seated, and was taken up dead; him St. Paul restored to life. On Monday the Apostle was enabled to join the vessel at Assos, a place between twenty and thirty miles distant from Troas. Thence he, with his companions, visited the Islands in the Ægean Sea, Mitylene, Chios, Samos, and Miletus. From Miletus he sent to Ephesus, which was only a few miles distant, and requested the Presbyters to meet him; and there he held a visitation of the Church of Ephesus, which included the Churches of the adjoining towns. When they were come

together, in a solemn charge as to their duties, he told them that they would see his face no more ; that he was going "bound in the Spirit to Jerusalem, not knowing what should befall him there," except that in every city the same testimony was given that bonds and afflictions awaited him. And he ended his discourse with a solemn charge, "Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers (ἐπισκόπους), to feed (ποιμαίνειν) the Church of God, which He has purchased with His own blood."

Proceeding thence by Coos and Rhodes, they found at Patara another vessel bound for Phœnicia, embarking on which they landed at Tyre. There they remained seven days with the disciples, who, speaking through the Spirit, exhorted Paul not to go to Jerusalem. But leaving Tyre, they quickly arrived at Cæsarea, where they abode "many days" in the house of "Philip the Evangelist, which was one of the seven." There the Prophet Agabus foretold Paul's imprisonment at Jerusalem, and his deliverance by the Jews into the hands of the Gentiles.

In vain his companions and the people of Cærarea implored him not to prosecute his journey. Nothing daunted, and accompanied by Luke, Aristarchus, and Trophimus, he continued his journey, arriving at Jerusalem shortly before the Feast of the Passover, where, says St. Luke, "the brethren received him gladly." On the next day he waited on James, the Bishop of Jerusalem, probably intending, as on the two former occasions, to terminate his journey at Antioch. From this, however, he was precluded by the riotous proceedings which followed his arrival at Jerusalem.

CHAPTER II.

THE LATER APOSTOLIC AGE.

RIOTS at Jerusalem—Paul rescued by Lysias—Sent to Cæsarea—Change of Government in Judæa—Paul before Felix—Before Titus—Before Agrippa—Is sent to Rome—His First Imprisonment at Rome—Martyrdom of St. James, Bishop of Jerusalem—Paul's Release—Fire of Rome—First Persecution of the Christians by the Roman Empire—Where did Paul go from Rome?—His Second Imprisonment at Rome—Doubts as to whether he visited Spain—Account of Peter—Was he Bishop of Rome?—His Imprisonment at Rome—Martyrdom of SS. Peter and Paul—Different degree of honour paid by the Church of Rome to the two Apostles—The Clementine Forgery—The Destruction of Jerusalem—The Christians retire to Pella—Altered position of the Christian Church—The last years of the Apostles—Second Persecution of the Christians—The Apostle John banished to Patmos—The Book of Revelation—Later History of St. John—Gnosticism—St. John writes his Gospel and Epistles—The Four Gospels—The Organization of the Christian Church completed by St. John—The Three Orders in the Ministry—Apostolical Succession—The Services and Ritual of the Early Church.

THE city would at the time of Paul's arrival be crowded with foreign Jews, who had flocked thither to attend the Passover. Amongst them were Judaizing Christians, "zealous of the law of Moses," and not favourably inclined to Paul, who, they had been informed, taught that Jews as well as Gentiles "ought not to circumcise their children, neither walk after the law of Moses."

Though James and the Presbyters of Jerusalem were easily convinced as to his innocence, yet they thought it expedient that he should give ^{it} an immediate and public denial. The Judaizing Christians he at once pacified by taking upon himself the vow of a Nazarite, the obligations of which are prescribed in the Book of Numbers (vi. 2—5); and by rendering himself responsible for the expenses (Numbers vi. 13—18), which were beyond the means of poor men, of four others who had taken upon themselves the

same vow. But a greater difficulty arose from the Asiatic Jews who had known him during his long residence in Ephesus. These men would be incensed against him, not only on the ground of his being an apostate Jew, but also on account of the increasing influence of Christianity. They had recognised in his company Trophimus an Ephesian, whom, being a Gentile, they accused him of introducing into the Temple, and thereby polluting the Holy place. The infuriated mob rushed upon Paul, and were only prevented by the sacredness of the building from tearing him in pieces. Dragging him out of the Temple they would then have killed him, had not Lysias the Chief-Captain arrived, who commanded the soldiers that he should be bound with chains to the arms of two of their number, and conducted into the castle of Antonia. Surprised at hearing him speak in the Greek language (for he had imagined him to be the Egyptian who in the preceding year (A.D. 57) had headed a rebellion, proclaiming himself to be the Messiah), and being informed by Paul that he was "a Jew of Tarsus in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city," he allowed him to plead his cause from the stairs of the castle.

Paul addressed the people in the Hebrew language. So long as he confined himself, as a Jew, to his own conversion to Christianity, they listened to him attentively; but no sooner did he speak of his commission to the Gentiles than they assailed him with shouts, "Away with this fellow, it is not fit that he should live;" they cast off their clothes as if with the intention of stoning him, and threw dust into the air. The Chief-Captain having again rescued him, ordered him to be taken into the castle, and examined by scourging. Whilst he was being bound with thongs, he asked the Centurion, "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman and uncondemned?" When Lysias was informed of this by the Centurion, he put to him the question, "Art thou a Roman?" and on his answering in the affirmative, Lysias answered, "With a great price obtained I this

freedom." "But I," said Paul, "was free-born." He thus escaped the punishment of scourging.

On the following day Paul was brought before the Sanhedrim, the very Council on which he probably had himself sat at the condemnation of St. Stephen. He declared that he was a Pharisee and the son of a Pharisee; "of the hope and the Resurrection of the dead I am called in question." The tumult which this declaration excited in the Sanhedrim, between the Sadducees who denied the Resurrection and the Pharisees who believed in it, was immense. The Scribes and Pharisees, who hated the Sadducees even more than they hated Christianity, declared, "We find no evil in this man; but if a Spirit or an Angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God." The tumult, however, continuing, the Chief-Captain, fearing lest Paul should be torn in pieces, ordered the soldiers to take him back into the castle. Paul's sister's son, however, having communicated to the Chief-Captain a conspiracy of more than forty Jews, who had bound themselves by oath that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul, he sent him secretly by night, under a strong escort, to Cæsarea, where Felix, the Procurator, a man of profligate and avaricious character, resided. Arrived at Cæsarea, the Centurion in charge surrendered him as a prisoner into the hands of Felix, together with a letter with which he had been charged from Lysias.

It is necessary here to explain a change in the government of Judæa which had followed the death of Agrippa I. As he only left one son, a boy seventeen years old, Claudius the Emperor re-established the office of Procurator, to which (A.D. 52) Felix, who married Drusilla, the ^{daughter} sister of Agrippa I., or rather persuaded her to desert her lawful husband, the King of Emesa, and live with him, was appointed. After a short interval, the son of Agrippa I., and brother of Drusilla, succeeded to part of his father's dominions, under the title of Agrippa II., the remainder of the country continuing under the Procurators. (On the

death of this Agrippa, the family of the Herods became extinct.)

Five days after the arrival of Paul at Cæsarea, Ananias the High-Priest, together with certain Elders of the Sanhedrim, and Tertullus, an orator, whom they employed as their counsel, having arrived from Jerusalem, Paul was put on his trial before Felix. That learned men, as the High-Priests were, should think it necessary to employ counsel, shows the high estimate they had formed of Paul's ability, and of the importance of the cause. Tertullus accused him of being a "pestilent fellow," a man of sedition, a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes, and of profaning the Temple. He complained that when the Jews would have tried him according to their law, the Chief-Captain, Lysias, delivered him with much violence out of their hands. The Procurator then beckoned to Paul to make his defence.

"They neither found me in the Temple," he said, "disputing with any man, neither in the Synagogue, nor in the city; neither can they prove the things whereof they accuse me. But this I confess to thee, that after the manner which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the Law, and in the Prophets: and have hope toward God, which they also allow, that there shall be a Resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. . . . Let these here say whether they have found any evil doing in me, whilst I stood before the Council, except it be for this one voice. . . . Touching the Resurrection of the dead I am called in question this day."

Felix delayed judgment until Lysias should arrive at Cæsarea. But after certain days, Felix, accompanied by Drusilla, who was a Jewess, had Paul again brought before him; and as he "reasoned concerning righteousness, and temperance, and judgment to come, Felix trembled," and told him that when he had "a convenient season" he would send for him; hoping that in the interval Paul would give him money to release him.

But for Felix that convenient season never came. Accused to Vitellius, President of Syria, of misgovernment and of undue severity in quelling an insurrection, he was sent to Rome, where Nero (54—68) had succeeded Claudius as Emperor, to answer for his conduct. Felix departed from Cæsarea, but “willing to show the Jews a pleasure, he left Paul bound.” Josephus, the Jewish historian, tells us, that for a time he was indebted for his escape from further punishment to the intercession of his brother Pallas, who was at that time in favour with the Emperor. Eventually he was banished to Vienne in Gaul, and (according to Eusebius) committed suicide.

At Cæsarea Paul remained a prisoner for two years (58—60), during which time Felix was succeeded by Porcius Festus. The High-Priest and the chief of the Jews desired him to have Paul tried at Jerusalem, “laying wait on the way to kill him.” Festus yielded to their wishes so far as to allow some of them to accompany him to Cæsarea, and on the next day Paul was called upon to speak in his defence. Paul answered for himself; neither against the law of the Jews, nor against the Temple, nor against Cæsar, had he been guilty of any offence. Festus next, “willing to do the Jews a favour,” proposed that the case should be heard at Jerusalem. But Paul, knowing that an attempt would be made on his life, claimed his right as a Roman citizen: “I appeal unto Cæsar.”

But once again, before being sent to Rome, Paul was to be heard at Cæsarea. Agrippa II., with Bernice, a woman of great beauty but of greater profligacy, sister of the scarcely less infamous Drusilla, came to Cæsarea to congratulate Festus on his appointment. Festus, at the desire of Agrippa, ordered Paul to be brought before them. The Apostle gave a brief summary of his own life. He told them how that after the strictest sect of the Jewish religion he had lived a Pharisee; how he once thought he ought to do many things against Jesus of Nazareth; how he spoke of his persecution of the Christians, and of his having

caused their imprisonment and death, compelling many to blaspheme. He related his conversion on the road to Damascus, and how since that time he had preached, first to the Jews and afterwards to the Gentiles, the doctrine of repentance; speaking only of what Moses and the Prophets had foretold, viz., that "Christ should suffer, and that He should be the first to rise from the dead, and show light unto the people and to Gentiles." "Why should it be thought incredible with you," he asked, "that God should raise the dead?"

Festus interrupted his noble defence with the exclamation, "Paul, thou art beside thyself, much learning (*τὰ πολλὰ γράμματα*) doth make thee mad." But Paul appealed to Agrippa's own acquaintance with the facts which he had narrated, for "this thing was not done in a corner." "King Agrippa, believest thou the Prophets? I know that thou believest." "Almost" (*ἐν ὀλίγῳ*), was Agrippa's reply, "thou persuadest me to be a Christian." But there he stopped; both he and Festus agreed that Paul had done nothing deserving death or bonds. Agrippa survived the destruction of Jerusalem, and died at an advanced age, but without any change of heart being effected, the type of the *almost*, but not *altogether*, Christian.

Paul had appealed unto Cæsar, unto Cæsar therefore he must go. His journey to Rome, on which he was accompanied by Luke and Aristarchus; his experience of the dangerous navigation of the Mediterranean; his shipwreck and consequent detention for three months on the barbarous island of Melita (probably the modern Malta); his landing and sojourn for seven days at Puteoli (the modern Pozzuoli) near Naples, where he found some Christians; the brethren coming to meet him at Appii Forum; his detention at Rome (whence he wrote his Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and the Philippians) for two years (61—63); his being permitted, fastened to the arm of a Roman soldier, to reside in his own house, to receive all who came to him, to preach the Kingdom

of God, no man forbidding him ;—these events form the concluding Chapters of the Acts of the Apostles.

Through the preaching of St. Paul during this imprisonment at Rome, the Gospel made rapid and important progress in the city, and Rome was thus added as another centre of Christianity to those already existing. “My bonds in Christ are manifest,” he writes (Philip. i. 13), “in all the Palace and in all other places ;” and again (Philip. iv. 24), “All the Saints salute you; chiefly they that are of Cæsar’s household.”

Unfortunately at this important juncture we lose the safe and inspired guidance of the Acts of the Apostles. The reason for such an abrupt termination must remain in obscurity. It cannot be attributed to the death of St. Luke, for there is little room for doubting that he survived St. Paul; at any rate it is certain that he was with him at the close of his life (2 Tim. iv. 11). But henceforward we are left to an insecure footing; we pass from inspired to uninspired records, and from these, or from a few scanty notices in his later Epistles, the remaining history of St. Paul must be gathered.

In the second year of St. Paul’s imprisonment occurred the martyrdom of St. James, Bishop of Jerusalem, surnamed (probably from his stature) *the Less*, who from his well-known virtues had gained both from Jews and Gentiles the title of *the Just*. Shortly before this time he had written his Epistle “to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad,” in which he reproves the Jews with having “condemned and killed the Just,” and hints that as a consequence of their sins, their day of visitation was drawing to a close, and the destruction of Jerusalem at hand. No doubt this excited the fury of the Jews. Disappointed, says Eusebius, in their attempts to kill Paul, they determined to wreak their vengeance on the Bishop of Jerusalem. It was the time of the Passover, when a large multitude of Jews was certain to be congregated in the city. Many persons of consequence had been led to embrace the Gospel, and the Jews

felt that a slur would be cast on the Christian faith, if the Bishop could be induced to deny it. Annas, an artful and cruel man, son of him before whom the Saviour had been arraigned, was the High-Priest. Festus the Procurator had died, and they seized the interval between his death and the arrival of his successor, Albinus, as a safe and convenient time to arraign the cousin of our Lord before the great Council of the Sanhedrim. As a matter of course he was condemned to death. Placing him on a pinnacle of the Temple, where he might be the better heard, and thinking that under prospect of this death his fears would be excited, they ordered him to address the multitude below. Instead of doing what they expected, and on his expressing his belief and love of the Saviour, they hurled him down ; and as he still survived, and whilst with his last breath he was praying for his enemies, a fuller despatched him with his beam.

St. Paul was detained a prisoner at Rome for "two whole years" (62—63). *Why* he was detained there so long before being put on his trial we nowhere learn ; he was, however, probably owing to his influential friends in the Palace and the city, acquitted, and released from his imprisonment. In the summer of A.D. 64 occurred the fire of Rome, by which ten out of the fourteen regions into which the city was divided were destroyed. The crime was at once imputed to Nero ; the historian Tacitus says, that by no human means, neither by largesses to the people nor by offerings to the gods, could he avert suspicion from himself. The man, who on his accession to the Empire at seventeen years of age, exclaimed when called upon to sign the warrant for an execution, "Would that I had never learned to write," was now changed into a monster of vice and cruelty. He sought a channel through which to escape public execration, and alighted upon the Christians ; "a set of people," Tacitus continues, "held in abhorrence for their crimes ; the Founder of whom was Christ, Who suffered death in the reign

of Tiberius, under his Procurator, Pontius Pilate. The pernicious (*execrabilis*) superstition, checked for a time by the death of its Founder, again broke out, and spread not only through Judæa but through Rome also, where everything atrocious finds its way and is practised." The Christians, he says, were convicted, not so much on the charge of burning Rome, as of hatred to mankind. He goes on to describe the terrible persecution of the Christians which followed, and the sufferings to which they were subjected. Every device of insult and cruelty was invented against them. Some were disguised in the skins of wild beasts and worried to death by dogs; some were crucified; others smeared with pitch, and fastened by the neck to stakes, were set on fire to give light by night. Nero lent his gardens for the purpose, and himself, in the dress of a charioteer, enjoyed the spectacle from his car.

Had the fire occurred whilst St. Paul was a prisoner in Rome, he doubtless (humanly speaking) would have perished in the immediate persecution of the Christians.

Where did he go after his release from imprisonment? and in what countries did he preach between his first and second imprisonment at Rome, that is to say, between the years 63 and 67? That he preached the Gospel somewhere, scarcely admits of doubt; but of this period of his life, which must have been one of the greatest importance, we know next to nothing. We can only piece together the fragmentary notices which can be gathered from his Epistles, particularly the Pastoral Epistles of SS. Timothy and Titus, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, (if indeed the latter is his, of which there is much doubt).

It may not be unreasonably inferred from his practice after his former missionary journeys, that he made his way from Rome to Antioch, passing through Macedonia and Crete (where some suppose that *at this time*^a he left Titus as Bishop); and Jerusalem, in fulfilment of his promise (Heb. xiii. 23); and

^a But see p. 44.

perhaps in company of Timothy. Returning from Antioch, he perhaps made Ephesus the centre of his operations, and there some suppose that *at this time*^b he left Timothy as Bishop. Thence he could have fulfilled the design which he had expressed in his Epistle to Philemon (Philem. 22) of visiting Colossæ in Phrygia. That Philemon was a Colossian may be inferred from the fact that Archippus, to whom conjointly with Philemon the Epistle is addressed, was a Colossian (Col. iv. 17); and that Onesimus, Philemon's runaway slave, through whom the Epistle was sent, also was a Colossian (Col. iv. 9). St. Paul tells Philemon (Philem. 22) to prepare a lodging for him; "for I trust that through your prayers I shall be given unto you."

From Colossæ he perhaps crossed the Ægean Sea to Macédonia, and fulfilled his promise (Philip. ii. 24) of visiting Philippi. About this time (65—67) he wrote his First Epistle to Timothy, Bishop of Ephesus, and his Epistle to Titus, Bishop of Crete. After staying some time at Philippi, he probably proceeded to Epirus, and wintered in Nicopolis, where he enjoined Titus to meet him as soon as the latter should be relieved in his duties by Artemas and Tychicus (Tit. iii. 12). Thence he might have passed to Corinth, where he left Erastus in charge; and then have crossed into Asia, in which country he left Trophimus an invalid at Miletus (2 Tim. iv. 20).

To this period of the Apostle's life are probably attributable the calamities mentioned in the Second Epistle to St. Timothy; "This thou knowest, that all in Asia turned away from me, of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes" (2 Tim. i. 15). Several passages in the First Epistle of St. Peter, written A.D. 64, to the Churches of Asia, indicate a fiery trial of persecution which befell the Christians in those countries. It was probably at this time that Paul's old opponent, Alexander the Coppersmith (Acts xix. 33), whom with Hymenæus he had "delivered unto Satan,

^b But see p. 44.

that they might learn not to blaspheme" (1 Tim. i. 20), "did him much evil" (2 Tim. iv. 14). Writing to Timothy (1 Tim. iii. 14) at Ephesus instructions as to the management of his Diocese, he told him that he hoped to come to him shortly, and being now in the neighbourhood, he might have had that interview with him, his "dearly beloved son" in the faith, and that affecting parting between the two took place, which brought tears into the eyes of Timothy (2 Tim. i. 4).

The persecution of the Christians under Nero was now at its height; and St. Paul (we know not whether as a prisoner, or voluntarily with the view of comforting the suffering Christians in that city) went to Rome. But it is not unreasonable to suppose that he was arrested at Ephesus or Miletus, or in the neighbourhood; that he was conveyed along the coast of Asia Minor, touching on the way to Rome at Troas, where he left with Carpus his winter-cloak (*φελόνην*), and books and parchments (2 Tim. iv. 13). Here, however, all traces of him disappear, until we find him (A.D. 67) for the second time a prisoner at Rome.

The question, which has been the subject of much controversy, still remains, whether between his first and second imprisonments at Rome he visited Spain, according to the intention which he had expressed in his Epistle to the Romans (Rom. xv. 24). The question is of the greater importance as bearing on the histories of the Churches of France and England; for if he went to Spain it can scarcely be doubted that he would have wished to visit Gaul, and probably Britain also. When after his first imprisonment he left Rome, the opportunity of fulfilling his promise would have presented itself, and several early writers mention his having undertaken such a journey. Most important of all is the testimony of St. Clement, Bishop of Rome, who was the friend and "fellow-labourer" (Phil. iv. 3) of St. Paul, and wrote only a few years after the Apostle's death. He speaks of St. Paul "having preached righteousness to the whole world, and having gone to the extreme boundary of the West" (*τὸ τέρμα τῆς δυσέως*).

Some think that the passage refers to Rome, but this can scarcely be accepted as the right interpretation ; for, as Clement himself resided there, he was evidently speaking of some country more westerly than Rome. But then, on the other hand, Clement, wishing to illustrate the zeal of St. Paul, confines himself to what could be deduced (and that was not much), from St. Paul's own Epistles, and does not go beyond them. So that his testimony (and this is all we have in the First Century) does not much conduce towards elucidating the matter.

The author of the Muratorian Canon ("Fragmentum de Canone S. Scripturarum"), written about the middle of the Second Century, seems to show (although in ambiguous and scarcely intelligible terms) that he was acquainted with a tradition of St. Paul having fulfilled his intention of visiting Spain.

In the Third Century no writers appear to refer to this visit westward.

In the Fourth Century, Eusebius (the earliest ecclesiastical historian), who spared no pains in collecting materials for his history, could find no early record of St. Paul's having visited either Britain or Spain, and relied for all his statements relating to St. Paul either on the evidence of the Epistles or the Acts of the Apostles. A similar construction must be placed on what is derived from other writers of the Fourth Century, SS. Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, and Jerome ; they either do not directly state that St. Paul went to Spain, or, relying on his intention of going there, they deduce their statements from Scripture only.

In the early part of the Fifth Century, Pope Innocent I. (402—417) challenged any one to prove that any other Apostle, except St. Peter, ever visited Italy, Gaul, or Spain. This challenge, however, loses much of its force, since Innocent, in his endeavour (after the manner of Popes) to magnify Peter, loses himself, and unites with Spain and Gaul (countries which

perhaps St. Paul did not visit) Italy, which every one knows he did visit.

The decree of Pope Gelasius I. published after a Council held at Rome A.D. 495, shows that St. Paul's having visited Spain was not believed by the Church at that time. It says, "St. Paul must not be thought guilty of deception (God forbid), or to go contrary to what he himself had set himself to do : since when he promised to go to Spain, *he was not able*, through the interposition of Providence, to do what he promised . . . He being prevented by Divine Providence, omitted to carry it out."

It is unnecessary to quote authors of a later date, either in favour of, or against, the journey ; for the further we get from the event, the less convincing the authority necessarily becomes. It must, we think, be left an open question for each person to decide for himself.

Even more obscure (if possible) than this period in the life of the Apostle of the Uncircumcision, is the history of the later years of the Apostle of the Circumcision. Of Peter's history, subsequent to his release from imprisonment (A.D. 44), and his visit to Cæsarea, "where he abode" (Acts xii. 6—19) ; and his presence at the Council of Jerusalem (A.D. 50), with the exception of the reproof administered to him by St. Paul, mentioned in the Epistle to the Galatians, we learn nothing from Scripture, beyond what may be gathered from the two Epistles which bear his name, the First written probably A.D. 64, the Second in 66 or 67. Extravagant statements, on the one hand, which claim him as Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years (a period till recent times almost universally accepted, but which now is generally disclaimed by candid Roman Catholic critics), and Protestant bigotry on the other, which contends that he never set foot in Rome at all, have centred round St. Peter more than any of the Apostles. That he did go to Rome at some time or other, we have the authority of St. Clement of Alexandria ; and that he

suffered martyrdom there, there is no reason to doubt. Eusebius devotes a chapter to the "Preaching of Peter at Rome" (Περὶ τοῦ κατὰ Ρώμην κηρύγματος Πέτρου), and quotes a passage from Clement, in which the latter says that "Peter having preached the Word fully in Rome," exhorted Mark, "who had followed him from the beginning," to compose his Gospel. But the absence of any reference to him in St. Paul's Epistles written to and from Rome, added to the general scantiness of ancient tradition, render it impossible to decide with absolute certainty as to when he went there, and how long he was in Rome before his martyrdom.

As to the martyrdom of St. Peter at Rome, tradition is so old and so unanimous in its favour, that, except for controversial purposes, it would probably never have been called in question. But with regard to his twenty-five years' Episcopate, or as to his having been Bishop of Rome at all, we can only put together such fragments of evidence as may conduce to an impartial judgment.

The assertion that St. Peter visited Rome in the second year of the Emperor Claudius (which would be A.D. 42), and there founded the Roman Church, rests on a single passage interpolated into the history of Eusebius. The period between that year and the martyrdom of St. Peter would be exactly covered by the twenty-five years which St. Jerome was the first to record as the length of St. Peter's Roman episcopacy. If he had gone there in that year he would of course have been obliged to leave Rome by the Edict of Claudius (Acts xviii. 2).

In the year 44 he was in Jerusalem, where he was imprisoned by the King Agrippa. After his release he went first, as we have already seen, to the house of Mary, the mother of Mark, after which we are told he "went into another place" (Acts xii. 17). What that *other place* was, we are not informed, but it can scarcely be supposed to have been Rome. St. Luke, who had just before expressly mentioned by name such comparatively unimportant

places as Lydda and Joppa, would not have dismissed in so trivial a manner the great capital of the Roman Empire, as to speak of it as "another place." It is probable that the place referred to was Cæsarea, where he abode (Acts xii. 19).

We find Peter again at Jerusalem A.D. 50, at the Council which was held there. If Peter had been in Rome when Paul and Barnabas suddenly went to Jerusalem to the Apostles and Elders, there would not have been time to summon him to the Council. Paul and Barnabas give an account of the great work effected by themselves amongst the Gentiles. Peter in his speech says not a word about Rome; and surely, if he had lately arrived from it, he would have made some mention of the progress of Christianity in the capital.

Nor did he return to Rome when the Council was ended, for the next year we find him at Antioch, on the occasion when St. Paul "withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed" (Gal. ii. 11).

In 58 St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans. If at that time St. Peter had been Bishop of Rome, St. Paul would certainly have made some allusion to its Bishop. Yet it is remarkable that he makes no mention whatever of Peter; even in the long list of salutations which he sends to the Christians at Rome (Rom. xvi. 1—16) he is not named. Even if Peter had at the time been absent from Rome, yet, had he been Bishop there, the Apostle of the Uncircumcision would surely allude to his brother of the Circumcision.

It appears that no Apostle had ever visited Rome when St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans was written. St. Paul speaks of his desire to go to Rome, "to preach the Gospel to you that are in Rome also," and to "impart some spiritual gift to the end that ye may be established." But it was St. Paul's rule, as he tells the Romans themselves (Rom. xv. 20), to preach the Gospel where Christ was not already known, but not to "build upon another man's foundation." And what spiritual gifts could St. Paul

bestow, which could not be equally conferred by St. Peter, if he had been Bishop of Rome? It seems, therefore, impossible that Peter could have gone to Rome before A.D. 58.

In the year 61, Paul was sent to Rome, and remained there a prisoner two years. After he had been there two days he called the chief of the Jews together (Acts xxviii. 17). He told them how that having been falsely accused, he had felt constrained to appeal unto Cæsar. They told him that they had never received any letters from Judæa concerning him, nor had they heard any harm of him. "But we desire to hear thee what thou thinkest; for concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against." If St. Peter had been Bishop of Rome, and preached amongst them, is it possible that they should have received no certain information about Christianity? that they should have only heard of it as a *sect*? that they should be ignorant of the history of St. Paul, and his persecutions from their own brethren? and that they should *now* be obliged to *desire* the information which they lacked?

Had Peter been Bishop of Rome during St. Paul's two years' imprisonment, it is hardly possible that they should not have met; yet not in one of the four Epistles that he wrote at that time from Rome, does St. Paul make mention of Peter. The only Epistle in which St. Paul does mention St. Peter is that to the Galatians, and the last event, in point of date, to which he alludes is the unhappy contention between them, A.D. 51. So that it does not appear that up to A.D. 63, Peter had ever been in Rome.

St. Paul was brought for the second time a prisoner to Rome, A.D. 67, and Peter does not seem to have preceded his arrival. For in his Second Epistle to Timothy, which he wrote that year, St. Paul says, "At my first trial no man stood with me, but all men forsook me; I pray God it may not be laid to their charge" (2 Tim. iv. 16). And in the same Epistle he writes (2 Tim. iv. 11), "Only Luke is with me." Would he so have written if Peter

were at the time Bishop of Rome? or if Peter had been then in prison, would not St. Paul have mentioned it?

The possibility of St. Peter having been Bishop of Rome seems therefore to be negatived by the uninterrupted recurrence of an alibi.

SS. Chrysostom and Jerome, and the historian Eusebius, make him to have been Bishop of Antioch, and it was a common opinion that he held that See for seven years, and that he was succeeded by Evodius. Pope Innocent I. claimed for Antioch a precedence next to Rome, on the ground of its having been the temporary See of the Apostle. But many difficulties stand in the way of accepting such statements. Above all, Antioch was the Metropolis of the Gentile Christians; and it seems unlikely that the Apostle of the Circumcision should have been the one selected to preside over it.

It is probable that, with the exception of St. James, Bishop of Jerusalem (whose case is peculiar), and that of St. John, who after the removal by death of all the other Apostles, presided over the See of Ephesus; the Apostles, in the restricted sense of the word, were not Bishops of any one Church in particular. They were missionary Bishops, engaged in founding and confirming Churches, over which they appointed a Bishop or overseer, as St. Paul appointed SS. Titus to Crete, and Timothy to Ephesus; thus communicating to others the episcopal gifts of ordaining and confirming, which they themselves had received.

"Ye shall be witnesses unto Me" (such was the commission given by our Lord to His Apostles) "in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, in Samaria, *even unto the uttermost part of the Earth.*" The last part of the commission, "to the lost sheep of the House of Israel," was especially assigned to St. Peter.

The late Professor Blount, of Cambridge, considers that Peter set out on his long mission to Asia A.D. 54. He probably made his way through Pontus, Cappadocia, and Bithynia, to the strangers

scattered throughout which regions (ἐκλεκτοῖς παραδήμοις διασπορᾶς) he addressed his Epistles. After their captivity in Babylon, only a small party of the Jewish people availed themselves of the permission given to them by Cyrus to return to their own country; a large number continued to reside in Babylonia; and Josephus, the Jewish historian, speaks of thousands of them (οὐκ ὀλίγαι μυριάδες) being resident in Babylon. That Peter proceeded to Babylon, an important sphere of work to the Apostle of the Circumcision, appears probable. His first Epistle, which from very early times has been accepted as his genuine work, was written from Babylon. Eusebius mentions a tradition prevalent in his time, that by Babylon Rome is meant, and many commentators, both ancient and modern, agree in the opinion that it was written from Rome, the mystical Babylon of the Apocalypse. But St. Peter's words are very plain; "The Church that is in Babylon, elected together with you (ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνελεκτὴ) saluteth you, and so doth Marcus my son" (1 Pet. v. 13). Why, when he mentioned one place he should mean another; why, when he expressly names Babylon, he should mean Rome, is unintelligible. No allegory, no metaphor is used throughout the Epistle; the whole is written in a clear and tranquil style, especially for one of the ardent and impassioned temperament of Peter. We cannot help thinking that the Epistle was written from Babylon on the Euphrates.

It is probable that Mark, of whom, with the exception of St. Paul's mention of him in the Epistle to Philemon (Philem. 24), we have heard nothing since he left Antioch in company with Barnabas (Acts xv. 39), accompanied St. Peter in his missionary journey through Asia. Peter, therefore, sends the salutation of Mark to the Churches of Asia, as if they were well acquainted with him. It is probable that St. Peter, before he left Babylon for Rome, sent Mark on before him with some communication to St. Paul, for Mark was certainly with the latter at Rome

during his first imprisonment. (Philem. 24.) On the release of St. Paul, Mark was again at liberty to leave Rome, and probably went to Colossæ, to the Church of which place St. Paul had particularly recommended him (Col. iv. 10). He then seems to have gone to Ephesus, for St. Paul, in his Second Epistle to Timothy, written during his second imprisonment at Rome, tells Timothy to bring Mark with him.

We may conclude that, in obedience to this summons, St. Mark again joined St. Paul in Rome, and he must have arrived there after the Second Epistle to St. Timothy was written; i.e. A.D. 67. St. Peter's journey Romewards, if he undertook it some time after he wrote his First Epistle from Babylon (A.D. 64), especially under the burden of increasing years, would have occupied a considerable time. He would probably revisit several Churches on the way; and as he had never as yet been in Europe, he would naturally be attracted to Corinth, where he already had many followers, and where he would wish to preach to the Jews, as St. Paul had in the same city preached to the Gentiles. We know how St. Paul rebuked the Corinthians (1 Cor. i. 12) for being broken up into several sects, some professing to be followers of Paul, others of Apollos, others of Peter. But that Peter had not as yet made a *personal* visit to Corinth appears (1 Cor. iii. 6) from St. Paul's expression, "I have planted and Apollos watered," and the omission of any reference to Peter's teaching; which would scarcely have been the case if Peter had personally, like Apollos, visited Corinth.

We conclude, therefore, that Peter arrived, for the first time, in Rome, A.D. 67, after St. Paul had written his Second Epistle to Timothy; and that on his arrival, he found Mark already there.

Arrived at Rome, St. Peter (and probably St. Paul also) encountered Simon Magus. Hippolytus, a writer in the early part of the Third Century, says that Simon Magus, having practised

his sorceries in Samaria, came to Rome, and engaged in conflict with the Apostles, and that Peter greatly opposed him. St. Justin Martyr, who was himself a native of Samaria, says that Simon Magus went to Rome in the reign of Claudius (41—54). Irenæus also had heard the report, with regard to which, however, he only says, "It is said." If so, he must have paid another visit to Rome on the present occasion; and several authors assign his visit to the reign of Nero. All, however, agree that he visited Rome at some time or other.

But if Justin's statement can be shown to have been grounded on an error, not only that statement itself, but with it the statement founded on it by Eusebius, St. Jerome, and Sophronius, of St. Peter's having gone to Rome A.D. 42, falls to the ground. Eusebius refers to it as his authority for saying that Simon Magus went *at that time* to Rome; and says that "Peter was *then immediately* taken by the Divine power to Rome" (to counteract him).

But Justin's statement *was* founded on an error. He says that Simon Magus having gone to Rome in the reign of Claudius, was honoured there as a god, with a statue erected between two bridges of the river Tiber, bearing the inscription *Simoni Deo Sancto* (to Simon the holy god). On the face of it, it is improbable that the Romans would venerate a Samaritan sorcerer as a god. But Justin was misled. In 1574 a statue was dug up in an island of the Tiber, now called Isola di San Sebastiano, with the inscription, which still remains, *Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio*, Sancus having been a god of the Sabines, by whom he was called *Deus Fidius* (i.e. *de fide*, a god in whom they believed). This is now the commonly accepted explanation of Justin's statement.

A few words must be said as to the state of Christianity at Rome when Peter arrived there. As Rome was the Capital of the Christian world, it is strange that the accounts of Christianity there are so meagre. But we know that it had flourished there

for some time, for St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans (A.D. 58) mentions their "faith being spoken of throughout the whole world." But there was nothing there that could be called a Church; no Bishop who could ordain Priests and Deacons to the ministry. St. Paul, during his first imprisonment, had added greatly to the spread of the Gospel in the city, and therefore, more than any other Apostle, might be considered the founder of the Church of Rome. But SS. Peter and Paul were now for the first time together in Rome, and the Fathers constantly speak of them as its joint founders. We have therefore sufficient evidence for concluding that the Church of Rome was at this time founded by the joint labours of the two Apostles. The theory that they were joint Bishops of Rome rests only on the authority of Epiphanius, and must be laid aside as uncritical and opposed to universal practice. There is no trace, says Dr. Döllinger, of the same Church having two Bishops.

On his second imprisonment Paul found a prison at Rome a place of much greater danger than on the previous occasion. The rapid increase of Christianity had now caused alarm to the civil authorities. On the former occasion Nero seemed by no means prejudiced against him. But with increasing years, the increasing ferocity of the tyrant had developed, and the favour of the Palace would have prejudiced Paul in his eyes. Paul, who in his first imprisonment was allowed to reside in his own hired house, was now placed in close confinement, so that Onesiphorus was obliged to "seek him out very diligently before he could find him" (2 Tim. i. 17).

He was attended by St. Luke, "the beloved physician;" but Demas, who had been his "fellow-labourer," and was with him in his first imprisonment (Col. iv. 14, Philem. 24), had now forsaken him, "having loved this present world" (2 Tim. iv. 10). In his Second Epistle to Timothy he says, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand."

Similar language is used by St. Peter in his Second Epistle,

which we may infer that he wrote at this time from his prison ; “ Knowing that shortly I must put off this tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ has shewed me ” (2 Pet. i. 14).

The martyrdom of the two Apostles is said by St. Jerome to have taken place on the same day, which is supposed to have been June 29, A.D. 68, the last year of Nero’s reign. Our Lord had signified by what death Peter should glorify God (John xxi. 18); “ When thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands (on the Cross), and another shall gird thee (on it), and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. ” Having first witnessed the martyrdom of his wife, he, from a feeling of unworthiness to die like his Saviour, was, by his own request, crucified with his head downwards, the place of his execution probably being the Vatican Hill, where Nero’s Circus was held. St. Paul, being a Roman citizen, was beheaded, and, it is supposed, on the Ostian Way, on the spot where now stands the Abbey of the Three Fountains. In the Fourth Century, the remains of St. Peter were transferred from the Catacomb of San Sebastiano (where they are said to have been buried) to the Basilica of St. Peter, which occupied the site of the present Vatican. At the same time St. Paul’s remains were interred in the Basilica of St. Paul, which stood where now stands the Church of San Paolo fuori le mura.

The different degree of veneration accorded to the two Apostles is observable in the manner by which their memory has been preserved at Rome. Whereas, in honour of St. Paul, a *comparatively* poor church, San Paolo fuori le mura, has been erected ; to St. Peter’s memory, and to hold, it is supposed, his body, has been erected the most magnificent Christian Temple which the world has ever seen.

Till the last half of the Second Century the belief prevailed that SS. Peter and Paul were the joint founders of the Church of Rome. St. Irenæus, writing A.D. 180, says that the *Apostles* having founded that Church, appointed Linus, who is mentioned

by St. Paul in his Second Epistle to St. Timothy (2 Tim. iv. 1) as first Bishop; that to him succeeded Anacletus, who is also called Cletus; and that St. Clement, or Clemens Romanus, the same probably as is mentioned by St. Paul (Phil. iv. 3) as his "fellow-labourer whose name is written in the Book of Life," followed in the third place. This order of succession is followed by Eusebius in his history, and by other historians both in the East and West. But Tertullian, who wrote about A.D. 200, mentions a belief prevalent at Rome in his time that Clement was ordained by Peter as his successor.

The question then arises, how did the belief that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, and that he ordained Clement as his successor, spring up, of which St. Irenæus, writing A.D. 180, knew nothing, but which prevailed in Rome when Tertullian wrote twenty years later? The answer is—By means of one of the most successful forgeries which the ingenuity of man ever devised, known as the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Recognitions, purporting to be the work of St. Clement, Bishop of Rome, and to be addressed to St. James, Bishop of Jerusalem.

St. Clement is made to say that Peter, when on the point of death, laid his hands on him, and in the presence of the Church forced him into his *chair* (hence arose the notion of the *Cathedra Petri*, the chair of Peter); and on this imposture the Popes of Rome found their claim to sit on the chair of Peter, and to be his successors, and the inheritors of his authority. But as we have seen above, even had St. Peter ever been Bishop of Rome, two other Bishops intervened between him and Clement; and it was impossible for Peter to have ordained Clement as his successor inasmuch as Clement did not become Bishop of Rome till A.D. 90, whereas Peter suffered martyrdom A.D. 68.

Yet by the time of Tertullian this monstrous fable had gained acceptance in Rome. The forger who assumed the name of Clement was an Ebionite heretic, a sect particularly hostile to St. Paul, and determined to magnify St. Peter. There is no

doubt that the forgery was believed, and there is no need of accusing a sister Church of anything beyond a reckless credulity. But it is not too much to say that, but for the forgery we should not have heard of St. Peter rather than St. Paul being the founder of the Roman Church ; and that on this, and another equally extravagant, and still more clumsy forgery, the Pseudo-Isidore Decretals^c, the whole superstructure of Rome's infallible supremacy was raised.

The fable soon did its work. Later assertions as to the Popes of Rome being successors of St. Peter prove nothing, for the reason that though their authors were men of undoubted sincerity, and often great holiness of character, yet their statements were a mistake founded upon a forgery, and were mere repetitions of the Clementines which they accepted as history.

The next great event in Ecclesiastical history in point of time after the martyrdom of SS. Peter and Paul, was the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70. The day of visitation was ended for the Jews ; the time had come when the Old Testament was to have its fulfilment, and it was to be shown that the law of Moses had only a typical meaning, that the promises related not to the temporal Israel, but to the Church of Christ.

The cruel government of the Procurators had long stimulated the rebellious spirit of the Jews, who still continued to expect the advent of the Messiah who should liberate them from the Roman yoke. Albinus, the next Procurator to Festus, was succeeded by Gessius Florus. Albinus had greatly oppressed the Jews, but the cruelty of Gessius drove them, A.D. 66, into open rebellion. Several thousand Jews having been put to death by the Roman soldiers, the Jews retaliated by massacring the whole Roman garrison in Jerusalem. Nero, irritated by a defeat which Cestius Gallus had sustained at their hands, sent (A.D. 67) Vespasian, the most experienced General in the Roman army, to quell the rebellion. Soon after the defeat of Cestius, the

^c See Chap. X.

Christians, mindful of the warnings of the Saviour, and urged, Eusebius says, by a revelation which was vouchsafed to them, fled to Pella, a city beyond the Jordan.

Nero died a violent death A.D. 68; Galba, Otho, Vitellius, followed him as emperors in quick succession; and Vespasian, who was then elected Emperor (A.D. 69), sent his son Titus to prosecute the war against the Jews. Titus appeared before the walls of Jerusalem at the Feast of the Passover, A.D. 70. The Jews themselves were not left without warning that the predictions of the Saviour with respect to Jerusalem were on the point of fulfilment. "What shall we say," writes Josephus (A.D. 37—95), "respecting a comet, which for a year hung over Jerusalem in the shape of a sword?" But they were heedless of the warning.

A large number of Jews had congregated at Jerusalem to celebrate the Feast. The Jews fought with desperate valour, and, but for the disorder which prevailed within the city, might long have kept the enemy at bay. Two of the three walls which surrounded the city were abandoned by them, but the fortress of Antonia and the Temple still remained standing; and so hopeless seemed the attempt to storm them by force of arms, that Titus determined to shut them within the walls, and to leave famine and pestilence to do their deadly work. The day had come when the Jews saw their enemies "casting a trench about Jerusalem, and compassing it around, and keeping it in on every side." Civil war also raged within the city, and the blood of the murdered polluted even the Holy of Holies in the Temple. It is not necessary to recount the horrors which filled up the cup of unhappy Israel. Not one element of misery was wanting. The prophecy of Moses (Deuter. xxviii. 56, 57), which would have seemed beyond conception, was fulfilled to the letter; "The tender and delicate woman among you which would not adventure to set the sole of her foot upon the ground for delicateness and tenderness, her

eye shall be evil . . . toward the children which she shall bear ; for she shall eat them for want of all things, secretly in the siege and straitness, wherewith thine enemy shall distress thee in thy gates." The city being at length taken was levelled to the ground, and a plough was passed over it in fulfilment of the prediction of the Lord, that "one stone shall not be left upon another." The gates of the city were alone left standing to show the site where Jerusalem once was. In vain Titus wished to save the Temple ; a firebrand cast into it by a Roman soldier caused a conflagration, and the Temple was destroyed on August 10, A.D. 70. Josephus, the historian, the Governour of Galilee, who had been taken prisoner at the commencement of the war, but pardoned by Vespasian, states that 1,100,000 souls perished either by the sword, or famine, or pestilence, and that 97,000 Jews were carried into captivity. Part of these were condemned to perpetual imprisonment in the mines ; part were sacrificed at the games in fights with wild beasts and gladiators ; and the tax which the Jews had hitherto willingly paid to the maintenance of the Temple, was thenceforward transferred to the idolatrous worship of the Capitoline Jupiter.

Thus the seat of the Jewish religion (and with it the power of the Sanhedrim) fell. Jerusalem was no longer the chief centre, as it had been before, of Christianity ; the Jewish Christians recognised the hand of God in the destruction of the city and the Temple : the Gentile Christians were delivered from the bondage of the Law ; and the distinction between Jew and Gentile gradually disappeared. The hatred, however, to Christianity on the part of the unconverted Jews remained unabated.

Mention has been made of the martyrdom of four of the Apostles, St. James the son of Zebedee and brother of St. John who suffered under Agrippa I. ; St. James the Less, Bishop of Jerusalem ; SS. Peter and Paul. We learn from Eusebius that

some time after the martyrdom of St. James the Bishop, the surviving Apostles from all parts met together at Jerusalem, to elect his successor, and that they unanimously chose his brother Simeon; a choice which, as well as that of his brother James, was probably owing to their being brothers, or rather cousins, of the Saviour. St. Simeon had no doubt accompanied the Christians in their retreat to Pella, and after the city began partially to rise again from its ruins, returned with them to Jerusalem; here we are told by Epiphanius and Eusebius that the Church flourished, and a great number of the Jews were converted.

We may be sure that this second Council of the Christians at Jerusalem did not separate without deliberating on their future plans, and what course should be adopted to meet the altered circumstances consequent on the destruction of the Temple, and the cessation of the services which they had hitherto been in the habit of attending.

With the exception of St. John we know next to nothing, except from unreliable sources, of the later lives and acts of the Apostles, and of other Apostolical persons mentioned in the New Testament; and even of St. John, considering how eminent an Apostle he was, we know but little. The traditions of the other Apostles are rendered more uncertain from the desire of many Churches to trace their origin to an Apostolic source, and we can only give them for what they are worth.

St. Andrew, the brother of St. Peter, preached the Gospel amongst the Scythians and Thracians, and suffered crucifixion at Patræ in Achaia, on a cross in the shape of the letter X.

St. Philip spent his last days in Hierapolis in Phrygia, where he suffered martyrdom, at an advanced age, under Domitian.

St. Bartholomew, or Nathaniel, preached in India (a country as to which much geographical uncertainty exists); and Pantænus, Head of the famous school of Alexandria, who went on a missionary journey to India at the end of the Second Century, found amongst the Christians there a Hebrew copy of St.

Matthew's Gospel, said to have been left by St. Bartholomew. He suffered crucifixion at Albania.

St. Thomas preached in Parthia, Persia, and the East Indies, and suffered death at the hands of the Brahmins.

St. Simon, known as the Zealot (Luke vi. 15), either to distinguish him from Simon Peter, and Simeon the brother of St. James the Less ; or, as some think, because, before he became an Apostle, he belonged to a sect amongst the Jews called Zealots (he is also called (Matt. x. 4) the Canaanite, a word of the same signification as Zealot) ; preached in Egypt, Cyrene, Mauretania, and returning to the East suffered martyrdom in Persia.

St. Jude (called also Lebbæus and Thaddeus, names probably given to distinguish him from Judas Iscariot), who, with his brothers SS. James the Less and Simeon, Bishops of Jerusalem, and Joses, were sons of Cleophas and Mary, sister of the Virgin Mary, was the writer of the Epistle which bears his name. He was a married man, and probably one of those to whom St. Paul refers : " Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as the other Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas ? " (1 Cor. ix. 10). Having preached first in Judæa, Samaria, and Idumæa, and afterwards in Persia, he suffered martyrdom (according to some) in the latter country ; whilst (according to others), having preached the Gospel in Edessa, he died a natural death at Berytus.

St. Matthias, of whom little is known after his election to the Apostolate, lived and died in Jerusalem.

St. Barnabas, after his contention with St. Paul, departed with St. Mark into his own country, Cyprus ; and this, and perhaps Egypt, was the probable sphere of his ministry. To him the Church of Milan attributes its foundation ; and St. Carlo Borromeo styled him the Apostle of Milan. An Epistle which bears his name, although considered authentic in the early Church, is now allowed to be spurious.

St. Matthew, or Levi, having written the first in date of the

Four Gospels especially for the Jews and the Christian Church of Jerusalem, died a natural death at Hieria, in Palestine.

St. Mark, the author of the second in date of the Four Gospels, which he wrote under the direction, and some think the dictation, of St. Peter, who calls him (1 Pet. v. 13) his "son" in the faith, is supposed to have founded and become the first Bishop of Alexandria; and to him some attribute the foundation of the famous Catechetical School of Alexandria. He is said to have fallen a martyr to the heathen of that city, who were incensed against him on account of the rapid progress of Christianity in their country. His martyrdom is supposed to have occurred three years after that of SS. Peter and Paul, and his body is said to have been in later times secretly buried in Venice (A.D. 815).

St. Luke wrote his Gospel under the eye and guidance of St. Paul, to whom Tertullian says it was often ascribed. But St. Luke himself informs us (Luke i. 2) that he derived the knowledge of what he relates from those "who were from the beginning witnesses and ministers of the Word." Himself a native of Antioch, he wrote it especially for the Greek and Gentile converts, of which Antioch was the centre; and it was probably written after those of SS. Matthew and Mark, but before that of St. John. The Acts of the Apostles, or, as it might be more correctly called, Acts of Apostles (Πράξεις Ἀποστόλων), since its object is to set forth *some* acts of *some* Apostles, chiefly SS. Peter and Paul, was probably written A.D. 63, as a sequel to his "former treatise" of the Gospel. After the martyrdom of these two Apostles, he led an active life; but as to where he preached, whether in Europe or Asia, a diversity of opinion exists. The scene of his labours was perhaps Bithynia; returning whence to Europe, he finished his course in Achaia at an advanced age, and in the opinion of several Fathers, suffered martyrdom.

Of the Virgin Mary, beyond what is told in the Bible, little is recorded, but she is supposed to have died at Jerusalem between the years 45—47. We know that St. John was at Jerusalem

when SS. Paul and Barnabas went there A.D. 49; we may suppose, therefore, that he resided in Jerusalem till her death, and devoted himself, in the fulfilment of the request of his dying Master, to the charge of the Mother of his Lord. The Assumption of the Virgin, grounded on the belief that her body was taken up into Heaven soon after her death, was celebrated as a Festival of the Church on August 15.

St. John, the beloved disciple, is the only Apostle who is known *for certain* to have survived the destruction of Jerusalem, in accordance with the words of our Saviour to Peter; "If I will that he tarry till I come" (i.e. in judgment upon Jerusalem), "what is that to thee." To him Asia was assigned as the sphere of his ministerial duties, with the special superintendence of the Church of Ephesus, the most important of the Asiatic cities: and to the seven Churches of Asia God's message is addressed in the Apocalypse.

After the martyrdom of SS. Peter and Paul, the Church enjoyed a long freedom from persecution. Vespasian (69—79), after a reign of ten years, was succeeded in the Empire by his son Titus (79—81), a man distinguished for his virtues, but whose life was cut short after a reign of two years, when he was succeeded by his brother, the rival of Tiberius and Nero in vice and cruelty, the tyrant Domitian (81—96), and under him the second persecution of the Christians broke out (A.D. 95).

The Jews still continued to look forward to the coming of the Messiah, who should deliver them from the Romans and restore to them their earthly kingdom. It is said that Domitian, thinking thus to destroy the possibility of a kingdom antagonistic to the Romans, issued an edict for the complete extermination of the House of David. Christianity had found its way into the Emperor's family, and Christians suffered from a supposed identity with the Jews. Two of the Emperor's relations, Flavius Clemens, the Consul, and his wife Drusilla, were amongst the victims of the persecution; being Christians, they were accused of Atheism,

which meant the refusal to worship the Gods of Rome ; the former suffered death, the latter was banished. Two grandsons of St. Jude, the Lord's brother, were, in consequence of the edict, brought before the Emperor. They acknowledged their relationship to the Messiah ; they showed their hands, hardened by the toil of cultivating their small farm of some twenty English acres ; they declared their expectation not of an earthly, but of a spiritual kingdom, which Christ should found at His second Advent, when He shall come again at the end of the world to judge the quick and the dead. They were then contemptuously dismissed.

A tradition is derived from Tertullian that St. John was, by order of Domitian, thrown into a caldron of boiling water outside the Latin Gate at Rome (whence the Festival of St. John Ante Portam Latinam, on March 6), from which the Apostle escaped unharmed. A somewhat similar deliverance is recorded of St. Paul (Acts xviii. 3—6), when a viper in the Island of Melita fastened on his hand, and "he shook off the beast into the fire, and felt no harm." The barbarous natives of the Island, expecting that he would fall down dead, at first pronounced him to be a murderer, "whom, though he had escaped the sea, vengeance suffered not to live ;" but when they saw that no harm came to him, "they changed their minds and said that he was a god." So that God might for a wise purpose have permitted the miracle in the case of St. John ; it would at any rate have been a fulfilment of the prophecy of his Saviour, that he should drink of His cup of suffering, and be baptized with His Baptism (Matt. xx. 23).

After this, Domitian contented himself with banishing him to Patmos (Rev. i. 9), an Island of the Archipelago or Ægean Sea, whither, he says, he was "brought for the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ ;" and where he received the Revelation. Being in the Spirit on the Lord's Day, he saw One like unto the Son of Man standing in the midst of seven

golden candlesticks (typifying the seven Churches of Asia), holding seven stars in His hand, which were the Angels of the Churches, and heard a great voice behind him "as of a trumpet," ordering him to write in a book and send to the seven Churches what he saw, "the things which are and the things which shall be hereafter." When he returned from banishment, which he did soon afterwards, on the death of Domitian, he wrote, in obedience to the command, the Apocalypse or the Revelation, containing the narration of what he had seen in Patmos; and sent it to the Angels or Bishops of the seven Churches of Asia, as their "brother and companion in tribulation and patience of Jesus Christ."

The Emperor Domitian was assassinated A.D. 96. Nerva, who succeeded, reigned only two years (96—98); he, however, immediately rescinded many of his predecessor's acts, and issued an edict recalling those who had been banished. After his return, St. John, making Ephesus a centre, travelled into the neighbouring regions, organising Churches, consecrating Bishops, confirming and regulating the services of the Churches, probably on the model revealed to him in Patmos. So that under St. John, the last of the Apostolic band, the Episcopate was fully organised and extended over the Church. St. John was also the author of three Epistles, and of the Gospel which was written after, and supplemental to, the Gospels of the three other Evangelists.

An interesting story relating to this period of St. John's life is told by St. Clement of Alexandria. A young man, in whom he interested himself, had, during one of the Apostle's tours, relapsed into evil courses, and become captain of a band of robbers. The Apostle, on his return, sought him out, reproved the Bishop for his remissness, and again reconciled him to the Church. Another beautiful feature in his character is revealed; how, being too old and feeble to walk, he would be carried into church, and when through weakness he could only preach the

few words, "Beloved children, love one another," he would afterwards explain to those who asked the reason, "It is the command of our Lord, and if this is obeyed, it is enough." He died at Ephesus in extreme old age, about the last year of the First Century.

Before the death of St. John, and even during the life-time of the earlier Apostles, the Church was assailed by heretics who tried to ingraft their doctrines on the teaching of the Apostles. St. Paul had mentioned (1 Tim. i. 19) Hymenæus and Alexander who "concerning faith had made shipwreck;" and again (2 Tim. ii. 17) he named Hymenæus and Philetus who taught that "the Resurrection had passed already, and overthrew the faith of many." St. Peter (2 Pet. ii. 1) spoke in anticipation of false teachers who would arise, who should bring in "damnable heresies (*αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας*), even denying the Lord that bought them." Such a heresy, as Peter foretold, St. Jude describes as in his time already existing; certain ungodly men had unexpectedly crept in, "turning the Grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying . . . our Lord Jesus Christ" (Jude 4).

The principal heresy that invaded the Church at this time, and which afterwards took the name of Gnosticism (a word derived from the Greek *γνώσις*, knowledge), is attributable to Simon Magus. It was probably to this heresy that St. Paul alluded when he spoke of "the science falsely so called (*τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνωσέως*), which some professing have erred concerning the faith" (1 Tim. vi. 20). The difficulty as to the origin of matter; an old question revived, "Whence comes evil?" (*πόθεν τὸ κακόν*), gave rise to the heresy of Simon Magus, with its two independent and antagonistic principles. The heresy arose out of the very first verse of the Book of Genesis; "Was the Demiurge, or Creator of the world and matter, the Great God, or had he a Superior?" According to what we must by anticipation of the name call the Gnostic philosophy, the Old Testament was antagonistic to the New; the Creator of the

world was distinct from and inferior to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This doctrine engendered the theory of *Æons* or emanations.

The professed object of the heresy, which took its rise in Samaria, and contained the germ of many heresies which assailed the early Church, was to reconcile the Gospel with the dualistic doctrines prevalent in the East. The Supreme God dwelling in the Pleroma (τὸ πληρῶμα; a term which St. Paul (Eph. i. 23) applies to the Church, "the fulness of Him that filleth all in all"), was the Author of all good. But, as matter is essentially evil, this Supreme God could not have been the creator of it. So they invented a second and inferior god, whom they designated the Demiurge, who was creator of the material world, and of man whom he created after his own image. This inferior god was the god of the Old Testament and of the Jews, whilst the Supreme God was the God of the New Testament. Christ was an *Æon* sent by the Supreme God to deliver man from the tyranny of the Demiurge, and to destroy his power. To oppose the Demiurge in every possible way was laudable; with them the fall of man, even the devil himself, who tempted Eve, was an object of praise. Simon Magus, and after him Menander, considered themselves amongst the *Æons*, to whom a similar work was assigned.

Of this school, during the First Century, the principal heretics after Simon Magus, who seems to have derived his notions during his travels in Egypt, were his pupil Menander, who like him was a Samaritan, and Cerinthus, who studied philosophy at Alexandria, but resided principally at Ephesus, and was a contemporary of the Apostle St. John. Cerinthus taught that Christ, the highest of all *Æons*, descended upon a Jew named Jesus, at his Baptism; that Jesus was not born of a Virgin, but altogether as other men are; that He was sent into the world to free men from the Demiurge, to reveal the doctrines of Christianity, and had the power of working miracles.

That the Demiurge, incensed with this attack on his own power, stirred up the Jews against Him; that *Christ*, being impassible, left Him before His Crucifixion, and the *Man* Jesus only suffered on the Cross, and rose again from the dead. Christ will be again united with Him at the general Resurrection, and establish a perfect kingdom to last for one thousand years.

Another sect, the Docetæ (*δοκεῖν*, to appear), taught that Christ had not a real Body, but was merely an incorporeal phantom or shadow, and His acts alone were apparent. Another sect was that of the Nicolaitans, who are reprobated by St. John (Rev. ii. 6, 15); but it would appear that they were the opponents not only of the doctrinal but also of the moral obligations of Christianity.

It would be an unprofitable task to describe the various modifications and sects which, under the common name of Gnosticism, prevailed in succeeding centuries in the Church. Nothing was too absurd, nothing too wicked for their imagination. Some like the Ophitæ or Naassenes (the former name derived from a Greek, the latter from a Hebrew word, signifying *serpent*) professed to believe that the most disreputable characters in the Old Testament, such as Cain, Esau, the men of Sodom, even the serpent, were the deserving objects of worship.

Amongst the opponents with whom St. John was brought into conflict at Ephesus were Cerinthus and the Nicolaitans. A tradition is recorded of him that, when on one occasion he went to the baths at Ephesus, meeting there Cerinthus, he rushed out, fearing that the roof would fall upon him. Both his Gospel and Epistles were written to set forth the Divinity of Christ, the co-eternal Son of God, against the teaching of Cerinthus and the Docetæ and such like heretics. He probably wrote his Gospel either at Patmos, or soon after his return to Ephesus, not less, therefore, than forty years after St. Luke's Gospel. He was addressing a generation of Christians who were familiar with the historical truths narrated by the three other Evangelists, and with the

principles of doctrine and discipline inculcated in the Epistles. It was his special object, and he, the beloved Disciple, who had been admitted to His closest intimacy and leaned upon His breast at the last supper, was the best fitted for it, to defend the doctrine of the Godhead and Incarnation of the Saviour. Hence he begins his Gospel with the words, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." In like manner, in the commencement of his Epistles (which he is supposed to have written after the Gospel), he speaks of "the Word of Life" which was "from the beginning," and of "the Eternal Life which was with the Father."

With St. John we have the complement of the Evangelical Canon. In reading the four Gospels, it cannot fail to be observed how each of the four Evangelists proceeds on a plan of his own, and how each contributes something peculiar to himself, in the work of co-operation with the others. Two Gospels, the first and the last, were written by Apostles of the Lord, who were eye-witnesses of what they relate; whilst St. Luke, "the beloved physician," wrote (as has been before stated) under the guidance of St. Paul, and St. Mark wrote under that of St. Peter. The vision of the four living creatures in Ezekiel (Ezek. i. 5—10) and in the Revelation of St. John (Rev. iv.), have from very early times been regarded as symbolical of the four Gospels, and to describe their distinguishing features. The Lion, the king of the forest, typifies the kingly character of Christ as set forth particularly by St. Matthew; the Man, the Human Nature as represented by St. Mark; the Ox or Calf, the sacrificial victim, His Priestly office as described by St. Luke. These three living creatures, says St. Augustine, walk the earth, and in like manner these three Evangelists describe especially what Christ did in the flesh. But St. John, like the Eagle, soars to Heaven, above the clouds of human infirmity; he gazes on the Divinity of Christ, by which He is equal to the Father, and reveals to us the mysteries of His Godhead, and of the Trinity in Unity.

The organization of the Church had been gradual, more developed in the Acts of the Apostles and Epistles than in the Gospels, and still more fully developed in the Revelation ; thus it was practically completed before the end of St. John's life. And may we not believe that the life of the Apostle whom Jesus loved was prolonged beyond that of the others for this very purpose ? Tertullian states that the Order of Bishops, if traced back, will be found to rest upon St. John, meaning thereby that under him the Episcopate was regulated and universally established in the Church.

In the Epistle to the Philippians, the last Epistle which he wrote to a Gentile Church, St. Paul mentions only two Orders in the Ministry, Bishops and Deacons (Phil. i. 1). In the Apostolic age, the Apostles themselves formed the first Order ; the second Order consisted of Bishops and Presbyters (the Bishop being the leading Presbyter, with power to ordain and confirm), whilst Deacons formed the third Order. But with the Apostles, their name also passed away, their successors, out of a feeling of humility, declining to adopt it ; the office of Bishops and Presbyters became divided, the Bishops thenceforward forming the first Order, Presbyters or Priests the second, Deacons the third. Without these three orders, says St. Ignatius, the name of Church does not exist (*ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται*).

SS. Timothy and Titus were, as we have seen, consecrated by St. Paul. This power of consecrating Bishops was entrusted by the Apostles to the First Order in the Ministry ; but as to the appointment of the first successors of the Apostles, we are thrown upon uninspired tradition.

The succession of the early Bishops of Rome we have already given on the authority of St. Irenæus.

St. Mark, who had received the Bishopric of the Church of Alexandria, was succeeded by Annianus. St. Ignatius was appointed, as St. Chrysostom informs us, to succeed Evodius ^d in

^d See p. 63.

the See of Antioch. St. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, was appointed, as we learn from Eusebius, by St. John himself, to the Bishopric of Smyrna, and probably was the Angel of the Church addressed in the Book of Revelation. Epaphroditus, "the brother and companion in labour and fellow-soldier" of St. Paul, was set by him over the Church of Philippi, whose Messenger, or rather Apostle (ὑμῶν Ἀπόστολον), St. Paul calls him (Phil. ii. 25). Dionysius the Areopagite, who we read (Acts xvii. 34) "clave unto him," was consecrated by St. Paul, Bishop of Athens, where he died a Martyr. Crescens (2 Tim. iv. 10) went (according to Eusebius) as Bishop into Gaul. Zacchæus (Luke xix. 5) is said to have been ordained Bishop of Cæsarea by St. Peter.

And this charge which they received from the Apostles, they handed on to others. Papias, of whom St. Irenæus speaks as a hearer of St. John and companion of St. Polycarp, was appointed Bishop of Hierapolis. Pothinus, consecrated by Polycarp, and sent by him into Gaul, became the first Bishop of Lyons; and on his martyrdom was succeeded by St. Irenæus, a pupil of Polycarp.

In this manner the Episcopal office has been handed down from the time of the Apostles to the present day, so that we read in the Ordination Service:—"It is manifest to all men from Holy Scripture and ancient authors that from the Apostles' time there have been these three Orders in the Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

All Bishops were of equal rank and at first of equal dignity; and would naturally meet together for consultation, as was the case in the first Council at Jerusalem. In time we shall find several dioceses combined under a Metropolitan, who was generally the Bishop of the chief city of a Province, and still later several Provinces united under a Patriarch.

There is reason for believing that by the end of the First Century the Gospel had been preached throughout the whole Roman Empire, the capital of the Empire and of the world being

Rome. A few words must be said of the doctrine and discipline of the early Church.

There were then, as has been already stated, the same three Orders of the Ministry which we have now. The election and consecration of St. Timothy may be taken as an example of the manner in which Bishops were appointed to their office. He "professed a good profession before many witnesses" (1 Tim. vi. 12), thus satisfying the faithful laity as to his fitness, and gaining their approbation. Then he obtained "the gift of God" by putting on of the hands of St. Paul (2 Tim. i. 6), which was accompanied with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. And this trust assigned to him, St. Paul empowered him to commit to faithful men, who should be able to teach others also (2 Tim. ii. 2).

Besides these three Orders, there were lower grades of ministerial persons, such as Evangelists, to whom was given the special work of preaching, and Prophets (perhaps with the gift of prophecy), and Deaconesses, or female ministers of the Church.

At a time when believers were not numerous enough, nor rich enough to build churches, the places of meeting for the services of the Church were private houses, and upper rooms, which were generally larger and quieter than others, and the tombs of the martyrs, and probably, at a later time, the catacombs.

Believers were admitted into the Church by Baptism, which was performed, in the name of the Trinity, by immersion, except in cases of sickness, when it was administered by affusion or aspersion. Whole households, adults, children, and infants, were without restriction of age admitted to Baptism, adults being subjected to a preliminary course of catechetical instruction; (hence the word *Catechumens*). The ordinary times for conferring Baptism were Easter and Whitsun-day, although it could be administered at any other time, the service consisting of

prayer, and signing the Cross on the forehead. Confirmation, or the laying on of hands, accompanied with unction or anointing, was conferred immediately after Baptism, and to this, as well as to Holy Communion which followed, infants as well as adults were admitted.

There is no doubt that the Apostles' Creed, which was so called, not probably because it was drawn up by the Apostles, but because it contained a summary of their teaching, has descended to us, although not in the exact words in which we have it now, from the First Century. Rufinus, a monk who wrote in the Fourth Century, says that the Apostles before they separated drew up the formulary for believers. St. Irenæus and Tertullian, however, only state that such a rule of faith existed from Apostolic times.

The earliest form of prayer, although no mention of its use is made in the Acts of the Apostles or in the Epistles, or by the earliest ecclesiastical writers, (probably because, when mention is made of public prayer, its use would be taken for granted), was the Lord's Prayer. Beyond this, there was no one set form of prayer for the whole Church, the Bishops arranging what they thought most suitable to their own people. The prayers of the Church under the direction of the Bishop were probably made extempore, and offered up by the Priest, as Tertullian says *ex proprio ingenio*, or in the words of St. Justin Martyr, "to the best of his ability" (ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ). The laity were instructed in their responses. We read (Acts iv. 24) of the congregation lifting "up their voice to God *with one accord*" (ὁμοθυμαδόν); and unless they had done so on some preconcerted arrangement, the confusion would have destroyed all reverence. The service probably ended with the Lord's Prayer.

Psalms and Hymns were used; Pliny in a letter to the Emperor Trajan, which will be quoted in the next chapter, speaks of the Christians singing alternately a hymn to Christ as God (*Christo quasi Deo carmen dicere*).

The "Breaking of Bread" was at first, following on the ordinary service, celebrated daily; but soon became weekly, on the First day of the week. Tertullian, however, and Cyprian think that the clause in the Lord's Prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread," was considered as authorizing a daily celebration of the Holy Eucharist. Like the first Institution, it was accompanied by a meal, at first preceding, but afterwards following it, called the Agape or Love Feast. The Bishop, or in his absence the Priest, delivered the Bread, and the Deacon the Cup, the consecrated elements which remained being taken by the Deacon to those who were absent through sickness.

The Liturgy bearing the name of St. James is now allowed to be the work of a later date; "we cannot," says Mr. Palmer in his *Dissertation on Primitive Liturgies*, "trace back the appellation of St. James' Liturgy . . . beyond the fifth century." At the conclusion of the Eucharistic Service the kiss of peace was given, and the whole concluded with the benediction.

But this mode of observing the Holy Communion exposed the Christians to much unjust accusation from the heathen, and the Agape which accompanied it led to such irregularity, that St. Paul complained to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xi. 20—22) of their turning the Lord's Supper into a common feast "not discerning the Lord's Body."

Wednesday, the day on which our Saviour was betrayed, and Friday on which He was Crucified, were kept as Fasts. Prayers, always ending with the Lord's Prayer, were made at the third, sixth, and ninth hours of the day, and frequently at night; or at such hours as in time of persecution they could be offered in safety.

Many of the Jewish Christians kept the seventh day of the week, or the Sabbath. But the great day of the week was the First Day, the Day of the Lord's Resurrection, which came in later times to be called Sunday. At the service on that day, passages from the Old and New Testament were read; Psalms

were sung ; after which followed a Homily or a sermon from the Bishop, or in his absence from the Priest. •

Confession was made in public, and Christians bound themselves by oath (*sacramento*) not to commit flagrant offences. "Gifts of Healing" were amongst the gifts conferred by the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 9), and in cases of illness, the Elders of the Church were sent for, who prayed over, and anointed the sick person with oil, that he might recover (James v. 14, 15).

It is impossible to say at what precise time all the above customs and ceremonies were introduced ; but they were practised in the primitive Church either during the First, or in the early years of the Second Century.

CHAPTER III.

THE AGE OF THE PERSECUTIONS.

THE Number of Persecutions—The Best Emperors sometimes Persecutors—Roman toleration of Religion—Why Christians in particular were persecuted—Christians confounded with Jews—Pliny the Younger—Persecution under Trajan—Martyrdom of St. Simeon—St. Ignatius—His Martyrdom—The Emperor Hadrian—The First Christian Apologies—Hadrian's Rescript—Second Capture of Jerusalem, and Foundation of Aelia—Altered position of Christians—First Apology of St. Justin Martyr—Account of Justin—Persecution under Aurelius—Second Apology of Justin—His Martyrdom—Martyrdom of St. Polycarp—Miracle of the Thundering Legion—Foundation of the Church of Gaul—The Martyrs of Vienne and Lyons—Martyrdom of St. Pothinus, Bishop of Lyons—Christianity in Britain—St. Irenæus succeeds Pothinus—Montanism—The Paschal Controversy—Victor, Bishop of Rome—Growing pretensions of the See of Rome—Persecution under Septimius Severus—Martyrdom of Leonidas, the Father of Origen—Perpetua and Felicitas—Apology of Tertullian—Persecution under Maximin—Philip the Arabian, Emperor—Prosperity more fatal to the Church than Adversity—Persecution under Decius—Martyrdom of Fabian, Bishop of Rome, and of Eastern Bishops—Account of Origen—St. Gregory Thaumaturgus—The Hexapla of Origen—He dies a Confessor—Cyprian—Case of the Lapsed—Novatus and Novatian—Martyrdom of Cornelius, Bishop of Rome—Violent conduct of Stephen, Bishop of Rome—Question of Re-baptism—Persecution under Valerian—Martyrdom of Stephen and Victor II., Bishops of Rome, and the Archdeacon Laurence—Martyrdom of St. Cyprian—Christianity becomes a *Lawful Religion*—Prosperity of the Church—Persecution under Diocletian—The Traditors—Martyrdom of St. Alban.

THE History of the Church during the Second and Third Centuries is mostly a history of persecutions. The number of persecutions which the Christians suffered under the Roman Empire has, by an arbitrary calculation, founded, however, on antiquity, been generally computed at ten, the number corresponding to that of the plagues of Egypt. The Emperors to whom they are assigned are—(1) Nero; (2) Domitian; (3) Trajan; (4) Marcus Aurelius; (5) Septimius Severus; (6) Maximin; (7) Decius; (8) Valerian; (9) Aurelian; (10) Diocletian.

It would be wrong to imagine that persecutions were always due to the mere caprice of an Emperor. So far from this being the case, some of the worst Emperors were, in their dealings with the Christians, more humane than the best. Some of the cruellest and meanest of the number abstained from persecution for the reason that they were too much occupied in their own pleasures and vices to give a thought to the Christians. It was frequently the best Emperors, a Trajan or an Aurelius, men who concerned themselves most in the general interests and well-being of the State, to the old laws and customs of which they thought the new Religion opposed, who were the worst enemies of Christianity.

The Roman Empire at this period extended over nearly the whole of the world, the Germanic tribes in the North and the Parthians in the East being almost the sole exception to its rule. Such a union of the nations of the earth under one Empire was favourable to the spread of Christianity. But a polytheistic religion, whose gods set the example of vice and sensuality, was essentially opposed to the worship of the One God, and to the pure morality which the Gospel inculcated. It need not be said that there were Roman and Greek Pagans whose lives were a pattern of domestic virtues and chastity; but it was in spite of, rather than as a consequence of, their religion; and such as met the outward eye, were the exception and not the rule.

Of all the heathen world, the Roman people were the staunchest adherents of their religion, and all the calamities which befell the Empire, wars, floods, pestilences, famines, earthquakes, were attributed to the anger of the gods on account of the toleration afforded to Christianity, and promoted the shout, "the Christians to the lions" (*Christianos ad leones*).

At Rome, as in Greece before it, religion was a matter of the head rather than of the heart, of politics rather than of conscience. Tertullian says that "an old decree existed that no deity

should be consecrated by the Emperor without the approval of the Senate." Though the law still existed, it was rarely, if ever, put in practice, so long as there was nothing in any strange religion which was dangerous to the commonwealth, or which infringed the institutions of the State. The Romans were, as a rule, tolerant of the various polytheistic religions of the nations which they conquered, the general principle being that, so long as their religion was confined to their own country, their gods arranged the forms and the character of their worship. But as to what religions were lawful (*licitæ religiones*) and what were unlawful, the State held to itself the right of determining, and such as were not thus sanctioned by law came under the number of unlawful religions (*illicitæ religiones*).

There were also laws against religious societies (*collegia, ἑταυρείαι*), and nocturnal associations were subject to the penalty of death.

It is thus easy to exaggerate the religious toleration accorded by the Romans to their conquered provinces, and the reasons can be readily understood for its not being accorded to the Christians. The Romans hated the Jews, on account of their turbulence and the trouble which they were always fomenting; with the Jews they identified the Christians; the religion of the Christians which held in common with the Jews the worship of One God being looked upon as a mere modification of Judaism. And even the Jewish religion had in the eyes of the Romans an advantage over Christianity, on the ground that it was a national religion, which Christianity, as enlisting its converts from all nations and quarters of the globe, was not.

Then again, Christianity was from its very nature a proselytising religion, and thoroughly antagonistic to the polytheism of the heathen. The God of the Christians was a "jealous" God, with Whose worship that of other gods was incompatible; to them the sacrifices of the heathen were an abomination, of which the duty which they owed to God demanded the extermination.

And yet we have not exhausted the list. Loyalty to the Emperor was part of the Christian Creed ; but the Romans further degraded their religion by enrolling the Emperors, and even the worst of the number, amongst their gods, and the divinity of the Emperor the Christians could not acknowledge. The more gods there were, the greater was the profit to a multitude of priests and merchants and mechanics, and this profit Christianity threatened to destroy. So the worship of Christ was thought to be opposed to the honour due to the Emperor, and the Christians were regarded as disloyal subjects and unfriendly citizens.

Christianity, too, was an unsociable and exclusive religion, and this exclusiveness was something so unintelligible that it was construed into hostility to the State. The Christians loathed the sanguinary spectacles of the arena, and with the theatrical amusements which were extremely popular with the Romans, but were bound up with Paganism, they refused to be brought into contact.

Everything went against the Christians. They separated themselves into *hetæriæ* or guilds ; their assemblies, which they were compelled to hold secretly and at night, from fear of their enemies, laid them open to suspicion ; disgusting rites, of which they were innocent, were imputed to them ; they were eaters of human flesh, in allusion to their spiritually partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ in their Eucharists ; indulgers in immorality, from a mistaken notion of the Agape, and *the kiss of peace*.

We have dwelt on some of the causes which brought the Christians into hostility with the Empire, because it is otherwise difficult to understand why such a peaceable and unoffending party should have incurred the fearful persecutions to which for two centuries they were, with only slight intermissions, subjected. The persecutions, which commenced in the First Century under Nero and Domitian, continued, till Christianity, through its patient endurance and the blood of the martyrs, and through

its consequent influence, gained such a hold upon the State, that it was a power to be reckoned with, and forced the recognition and toleration of the Emperors.

At the beginning of the Second Century, Trajan was Emperor (98—111). "Be more fortunate than Augustus, better than Trajan" (*sis fortunatior Augusto, melior Trajano*), the acclamation which greeted future Emperors, shows the estimation in which his memory was held by the Roman populace. Yet, however averse he might naturally have been from persecution, an edict issued in his reign forbidding secret societies (*hetæriæ*) re-opened the flood-gates of persecution, and under him the third persecution of the Christians occurred.

Christianity was not one of the number of the *lawful* religions, and an edict of Nero which constituted it a capital offence remained unrepealed. Pliny the younger, son of the Pliny who was killed in the eruption of Vesuvius which overwhelmed Pompeii and Herculaneum, had been appointed Proconsul of Pontus and Bithynia, and became one of the best and most generous governours of a Roman Province. On arriving in his Province he found a large number of Christians, who refused to offer sacrifice to the gods, or take part in any of the religious heathen ceremonies. He wrote a letter to Trajan for instructions as to the mode of dealing with them. The letter is of importance as showing the condition of Christianity at the time. "The contagion of this superstition," he wrote, had seized not only the cities, but the smaller towns also, and villages in the country. Many persons of all ages, of every rank, and of both sexes, were accused of it. (The same objections and on the same grounds which had been before raised against St. Paul at Ephesus were now brought against the Christians; the heathen temples had been deserted, the sacrifices intermitted, and the sale of the sacrificial victims fallen off.) Those who were accused he threatened with death; some still persisted, and them he ordered to be punished. But "the crime" spread even under persecution,

although some recanted and reviled Christ and worshipped the image of the Emperor and the statues of the gods. But even these confessed that the only fault of the Christians was, that on a stated day they met before it was light, and sang a hymn alternately to Christ, as a God, and bound themselves by an oath against the commission of any wickedness. After this they separated and met together for a meal (the Agape or Love-Feast), which they eat without disorder. Pliny says that he examined by torture two maid-servants (*ministrae*, probably Deaconesses) but could discover nothing beyond "a bad and excessive superstition."

Trajan was well aware that the Jewish people had long been in a state of thinly-veiled insubordination, and he doubtless had very indistinct notions as to the difference between Jews and Christians. His rescript implies his acquaintance with the existence of the law under which the Christians were subject to the extreme penalties of torture and death. But he connived at the existence of Christianity. He told Pliny that the Christians were not to be *sought for*, but that if brought before him and convicted they ought to be punished. But in no case should a bill of information be received without the signature of the informer; and then if any one denied being a Christian, or showed his repentance by sacrificing to the gods, he should be pardoned.

Through the edict, Eusebius says, the violence of the persecution was in some measure abated, and, although no doubt many others suffered, with the exception of SS. Simeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, and Ignatius who succeeded Evodius as Bishop of Antioch, there is no authoritative record of a general persecution of the Christians under Trajan. At an early period of his reign, perhaps as early as A.D. 107, and before the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan, the martyrdom of the venerable Simeon occurred. He was accused by some Gnostic heretics before Atticus, the Proconsul of Palestine, with being a descendant of

the House of David, and, as such, an aspirant to the throne. After having suffered torture, which he bore with extraordinary fortitude for many days, he was crucified at the age of one hundred and twenty years, and succeeded in the See by Justus, a Jew.

In the persecution which ensued on the publication of the edict, the most notable martyr was St. Ignatius. At the very time that Trajan was passing through Antioch, A.D. 107, on an expedition against the Parthians, the city was visited by a disastrous earthquake, by which the life of the Emperor himself was endangered. The calamity was attributed, as such calamities generally were, to the wrath of the gods on account of the toleration granted to the Christians, and the cry, *the Christians to the lions*, was at once raised. The Bishop was arrested early in February, and brought before the Emperor, by whom he was sentenced to be taken in chains to Rome and thrown to the wild beasts, in the Amphitheatre.

Of the early life of St. Ignatius little is known, nor is it known in what year he succeeded Evodius in the See of Antioch, but he was a contemporary of the Apostles, and is said to have been appointed to the See by St. Peter. He speaks of himself as Theophorus, which he explains as meaning one "who has Christ in his breast"; and was supposed by some to have been the infant whom Jesus took up and set in the midst of the disciples as a pattern of humility; but against this, St. Chrysostom says that St. Ignatius never saw the Lord. Why, considering that Trajan is generally exempted from the charge of voluntary persecution, an exception should have been made in the case of Ignatius, does not appear. Perhaps Ignatius, who showed himself not only willing to endure, but even desirous of martyrdom, voluntarily surrendered himself, and if (as seems not improbable from his letters) he courted martyrdom in his trial before the Emperor, he might thus have provoked the anger of Trajan and of the government. Or it may be that the Emperor

thought that the example of so considerable a victim as a Bishop would strike terror into others, and thus exterminate what was described as the depraved and extravagant superstition of Christianity. When Ignatius heard the sentence passed on him, he exclaimed with joy, "I thank Thee, O Lord, that Thou hast vouchsafed to honour me with a perfect love towards Thee, and hast made me to be put in iron bonds, with Thy Apostle Paul."

His journey towards the coast at once became noised abroad throughout the Churches of Asia, and on his road he was met by several Bishops of the neighbouring Churches desirous of taking a solemn leave of him. At Smyrna he stopped several days with the Bishop St. Polycarp, who like himself had been the disciple of St. John, and like him also was soon to fall a martyr to the Faith. From Smyrna he wrote letters to the Churches of the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, and Romans; and again from Troas he wrote three other letters to the Smyrnæans, the Philadelphians, and St. Polycarp; in all, seven letters.

It is somewhat remarkable that in none of his letters, not even in the one addressed to the Church of Rome, the good deeds of which he acknowledges, does he mention the Bishop of that See, which he certainly would have done if any particular dignity attached to its Bishops. In his letters, he reminds the Churches of the great truths of the Gospel, and in view of approaching heresy, dwells on the blessing of unity. In his letter to the Trallians, he speaks of the three Orders of the Ministry, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, "without which there is no Church." "Every Bishop is the Vicar of Christ." "Ye are subject to your Bishop as to Jesus Christ . . . to your Presbyters as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ; . . . to the Deacons as the ministers of the mysteries of Jesus Christ." To the Magnesians he enjoins, "Be subject to your Bishop, and to one another, as Jesus Christ to the Father according to the Flesh." To the Ephesians he writes, "Unless a man comes to the Church's Altar, he is deprived of the Bread of God." To the

Romans ; “I fear your love, lest it do me an injury . . . Ye cannot do me a greater kindness than to suffer me to be sacrificed unto God . . . Suffer me to be the food of the wild beasts, by whom I shall attain unto God . . . My birthday is at hand. For I am the wheat of God, and I shall be ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ ; encourage the beasts, that they may become my sepulchre, and may leave nothing of my body.” “Flee divisions,” he enjoins the Philadelphians, “and false doctrines ; . . . partake all of the same Eucharist ; for there is but one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one Cup in the unity of His Blood.” “If any one follow those who cause divisions, he will have no lot in the kingdom of God.” To the Smyrnæans he writes ; “Let no one officiate in the Churches without the sanction of the Bishop . . . Without authority from the Bishop, it is not lawful to baptize nor to celebrate the Communion.” To Polycarp he gives instructions as to his duties ; “Stand firm and immovable,” he says, “as an anvil which is beaten upon ;” and through him he once more sends advice to the Smyrnæans ; “Hearken unto your Bishop that God also may hearken unto you.”

On the long and tedious journey to Rome, which an old man like him was ill able to bear, he suffered much from the cruelty of the soldiers who were appointed as guard over him ; “From Syria even unto Rome,” he says in his letter to the Romans, “I fight with beasts both by sea and land, both night and day, being bound to ten leopards, that is to a band of soldiers.”

Arrived in Rome, his desire was speedily accomplished. The scene of his martyrdom was the Flavian Amphitheatre ; so called because it was commenced by one member of the Flavian family, the Emperor Vespasian, and dedicated by another, his son Titus. It afterwards received the name of Colosseum, either from its colossal dimensions, or from a colossal statue of Nero which stood in front of it. It was the last day of the Saturnalia, probably A.D. 107, when, being thrown to the lions, Ignatius was

instantly despatched by them, nothing but the larger bones remaining. These, however, were collected by his friends, and conveyed back to Antioch, being received with much honour by the Churches on the road.

Trajan died in Cilicia A.D. 117, and was buried at Rome under the column which still bears his name, and which had been erected three years previously to commemorate his victories. He was succeeded by Publius Ælius Hadrian (117—138).

Tertullian says that Hadrian was not a persecutor of the Christians. Probably his mind was averse to persecution, but that a persecution of the Christians took place during his reign is certain. His enquiring and indefatigable mind led him to visit the extreme provinces of the Empire; amongst other provinces he visited Britain, where he caused a wall to be built to protect the Roman territory from the incursions of the Northern Caledonians. Hence he could not have been ignorant of the character and the growing influence of Christianity.

Hadrian paid two visits to Greece, A.D. 122. Publius, the successor of Dionysius the Areopagite in the See of Athens, had suffered martyrdom (but in what year is uncertain), and was succeeded by Quadratus. Quadratus, a man eminent for his piety and missionary zeal, addressed to the Emperor the first of a series, which afterwards became frequent, of *Apologies*, or Defences of Christianity, against its persecutors. Another was soon afterwards published by Aristides, a converted philosopher. These Apologies were received in no unfriendly spirit by Hadrian. When in several Asiatic provinces the cry of *the Christians to the lions* was raised, Serenus Granianus, the Proconsul of Asia, wrote to consult the Emperor as to the course which he wished him to adopt; it was unjust, he said, that Christians should be put to death without trial, and without any crime being imputed to them, simply to gratify the shouts of the people. This drew forth from the Emperor a Rescript

addressed to Minucius Felix, his successor, which was even more favourable to the Christians than the Rescript of Trajan. He went a step further than Trajan, and ordered that if accusations were proved against the Christians of acting contrary to the laws, they were to receive punishment in proportion to the offence ; but the greatest care was to be taken (*illud magnopere curabis*) that calumnious accusations should be visited on the authors, as they deserve. Still, too much power of harassing and persecuting the Christians was left in the hands of the Roman governours.

These Apologies are not extant, but they would more readily gain the ear of the Emperor, as they disabused his mind of the identity of Jews and Christians, the former of whom had long been in a state of smouldering rebellion. During the reign of Trajan the Jews of Cyrene in Libya had, A.D. 115, broken out into open insurrection, which was only suppressed after several hard-fought battles and a terrible massacre of the Christians. The reign of Hadrian was particularly calamitous to the Jews, he determined wholly to exterminate the rebellious race. He goaded their turbulent spirit by inflicting on them the grossest indignities and exactions, even, it was said, forbidding the rite of circumcision.

A formidable rebellion of Jews under a leader who assumed the name of Barcochebas, the Son of a Star (a name by which he signified that he was the Star predicted by Balaam) was the consequence (A.D. 132). He gave out that he was the long-promised Messiah sent to establish a temporal dominion, and to liberate the Jews from the Romans. The Christians now doubly suffered ; on the one hand from the Romans who confounded them with the Jews, on the other from Barcochebas and the Jews, because they refused to "deny Jesus of Nazareth" and to recognise the impostor. All the horrors of the first siege of Jerusalem were repeated, and the rebellion was only repressed after several desperate battles had been fought, and by the

capture of the fortress of Bithera (A. D. 135), in which the impostor had established the seat of his government. Palestine was reduced to a state of ruin. Five hundred and eighty thousand persons, besides large numbers who died from hunger and other causes, are said to have been killed in the war. The Jews were expelled from Jerusalem; thenceforward no Jew was allowed to enter the Holy City, except on one day in the year, that day being the anniversary of the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus; and then only on the payment of a heavy fine. The Roman colony of *Ælia* (so designated after one of the names of the Emperor), took the place of Jerusalem; whilst the feelings of the Christians also were outraged, by the erection of one Temple to Jupiter on Mount Moriah, and of another on Mount Calvary to Venus.

Their birth-right had now entirely and for ever departed from Israel. Their captivity in Babylon had been temporary, but now they were permanent outcasts on the face of the earth. An important change followed in the Christian Church; all the fifteen Bishops of Jerusalem had hitherto been Jews, but a Gentile, named Marcus, was now for the first time appointed Bishop of Jerusalem. The Christians had hitherto suffered in the eyes of the heathen from a supposed identity with the Jews; now the difference between the two was thoroughly established; thenceforward only Gentile Christians, and such of the Jewish Christians as were willing to abandon the law of Moses, were allowed to inhabit Jerusalem, the Judaizing Christians retiring to Pella. Here they became split up into two sects, Nazarenes and Ebionites; the former name, which had hitherto been a common appellation of Christians, now became confined to a party which held that the Mosaic Law was not binding on Gentile Christians; whilst the Ebionites, who took their name as some suppose from a Hebrew word signifying *poor*, but more probably after their leader Ebion, held that it was binding on all Christians alike, whether Jews or Gentiles.

The mild and gentle Antoninus Pius (138—161), the successor of Hadrian, was personally favourable to the Christians; but to revoke the decrees of his predecessors against them would have been tantamount to a revolution in the Empire, and so far as that he was not ready to proceed. But he confirmed the Edict of Hadrian, whereby the Christians were not to be punished without a trial; yet during his reign they were not entirely free from persecution, and their sufferings at the hands of the populace, and the martyrdom of Telesphorus, Bishop of Rome (128—139), during the persecution, called forth the First Apology of St. Justin Martyr.

Justin was a native of Neapolis, a city built on the site of the ancient Sichem, in Samaria. Born (circ. A.D. 100) of pagan parents, he at first embraced various systems of philosophy. His experiences as a philosopher and his subsequent conversion to Christianity he narrates in his Dialogue with Tryphon a Jew. He surrendered himself, he says, first to the Stoics, next to the Peripatetics, next to the Pythagoreans, and lastly to the Platonists; but in one and all he was disappointed and disgusted. Whilst, in such a state of perplexity, he was one day walking by the sea-shore, sunk in solitary meditation on the abstract questions of philosophy, he was met by an old man of venerable and comely aspect, who convinced him of the unsatisfactory teaching of philosophy with regard to God and the soul of man; he directed him to the study of the Prophets who lived before the days of philosophy, and to the Holy Scriptures, where alone, through the aid of God, he could discern the truth. Justin had been already attracted towards Christianity by the impression made on his mind by the patient sufferings of the martyrs. As he says in his Second Apology: "Whilst I was delighted with the philosophy of Plato, and even whilst I was listening to the calumnies of the Christians, yet when I saw them so regardless of death and perils which the world thinks so terrible, it seemed to me impossible that they should be guilty of lust and crime."

Justin never forgot that interview with the old man ; a flame was kindled in his soul ; a love of the Prophets and of Christ Whom they foretold, gained complete possession of him, and ended in his embracing Christianity, which, whilst still retaining his philosophic cloak, he assiduously propagated in the East.

He established a school of Philosophy at Rome ; and whilst at Rome (A.D. 139), at the commencement of the reign of Antoninus, he addressed to him his First Apology, in which he tells him it was not his design to flatter him, but to obtain justice for a set of men much and unjustly abused. The Emperor was everywhere surnamed the *Pious* ; he calls upon him therefore to prove himself worthy of the title, and to judge the Christians according to the usual laws of equity ; not to listen to words of violence, nor to act without proof ; to subject them to a close examination, but only in case they were guilty, to punish them. He explains the doctrines of the Christians, the Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, and their observance of the Lord's Day. He attributes the Pagan persecutions of the Christians to the instigation of demons ; states that the Christians expected not a temporal but a spiritual kingdom ; and shows that the life and death of our Saviour, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the conversion of the Gentiles, had all been foretold by the Hebrew Prophets. He appeals to the innocent lives of the Christians, and their patient endurance of persecution. Their persecutors would be called to account at the Day of Judgment, and the Emperor would be able to plead no excuse before God, if he acted unjustly towards them.

The peace of the Church was rudely impaired during the reign of the adopted son and successor of Antoninus, the Stoic philosopher, Marcus Aurelius (161—180). Aurelius was a strictly religious heathen, distinguished for his ascetic morality, his wisdom and justice, and was one of the best of the Roman Emperors. But at the same time he was, with Nero, the worst

foe that Christianity had encountered. The essence of Stoicism was intellectual supremacy and an exemption from all outward passions ; and the Emperor was of so tranquil a disposition that it was said that his countenance never betrayed any traces either of sadness or of joy. But between Stoicism and Christianity there was but little affinity ; he despised the Christian religion as fanaticism, and condemned the patient resignation of the Christians under persecution, as obstinacy. Unfortunately for the Christians, calamities from all sides beset Italy during his reign. Earthquakes and epidemics prevailed throughout the Empire. A famine was the consequence of a war carried on both in the East and West ; at Rome the Tiber overflowed its banks, not only destroying many buildings, but sweeping away the cattle and the granaries. A plague desolated the city, and the bodies of the dead heaped up on waggons were carted away from Rome for burial. All these things were attributed to the anger of the gods, which the Christians had provoked, and the Emperor was carried away by the popular tide.

Such limited protection as his predecessors had granted the Christians was withdrawn ; Governours of Provinces no longer observed a mere passive attitude. Christians were searched for, and when apprehended, after suffering cruel tortures, were crucified, or burnt, or thrown to the wild beasts.

At an early period of the reign, Justin Martyr published his Second Apology for the Christians. Crescens, a Cynic philosopher living in Rome, had accused them of Atheism and impiety. Justin denounces him as a boisterous braggart, and asserts the superiority of the doctrines of Christianity over all others. No one thought of dying, he says, for the doctrines of the heathens, but for Jesus Christ, men of all ranks and classes, not only philosophers, but unlearned men and men who gain their livelihood by the labour of their hands, die every day. All that Christians could do in a righteous cause they have done, and he exhorts Princes to decide on principles of piety and justice. At the

same time he expresses a presentiment of his own approaching end, and that he would fall a victim to the instigations of Crescens.

The able Apology of St. Justin was ineffectual in deflecting the Emperor from his purpose, and the jealousy and vengeance of Crescens led, as he had foretold, to his martyrdom (A.D. 163). Justin was denounced before the Prefect of Rome, who was himself a Stoic and had been the Emperor's tutor in the Stoic philosophy. Death or sacrifice to the Gods was the alternative offered him, and on his refusing to sacrifice and declaring himself a Christian, he was first scourged and afterwards beheaded. Thus he gained the title which from early times to the present day has been accorded him, Justin Martyr.

His martyrdom was followed a few years later (perhaps A.D. 166) by that of St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, the last of those who are styled Apostolic Fathers, that is those who were disciples of, or who had lived under, the Apostles; the other two being SS. Clement of Rome and Ignatius. It has been already mentioned that Polycarp had been the disciple of St. John, that he was supposed to have been consecrated by him to the See of Smyrna, and was probably the Angel of that Church addressed in the Revelation. He became teacher of a band of disciples, prominent amongst whom were St. Irenæus and Papias, and his connexion with St. John increased the reverence in which he was held both in the Eastern and Western Churches.

As to his native country and parentage little is known. He was probably born near Antioch, and perhaps in Smyrna itself, and converted early in life by Bucolus, Bishop of Smyrna, whom he succeeded in that See. To Polycarp, Ignatius when on his way to his martyrdom at Rome, entrusted the care of his flock at Antioch. During the episcopate of Anicetus, Bishop of Rome (157—167), Polycarp went thither to confer with him as to the proper time of keeping Easter, with respect to which a different practice existed in the Eastern and Western Churches. The

Asiatics, following the time of the Jewish Passover, celebrated the Paschal Supper on the fourteenth day of the first Jewish month, Nisan (from which practice they were called *Quartodecimans*); and three days later, whether the day was Sunday or not, the Feast of the Resurrection. The Western Church, on the contrary, always kept their Easter on Sunday, referring their custom to SS. Peter and Paul, whilst the Easterns attributed theirs to SS. John and Philip. The discussion was carried on between the two Bishops in a friendly spirit (the Clementine fiction as to the inherent supremacy, derived from St. Peter, in the Bishop of Rome, was as yet unknown); they failed, however, to arrive at an agreement; but the Bishop of Rome requested Polycarp to be celebrant at the Holy Eucharist, at which he himself was present.

The persecution under Aurelius reached Smyrna. St. John in the Revelations had written to the Angel of the Church of Smyrna; "These things saith the First and the Last, which was dead and is alive. . . . Fear none of these things which thou shalt suffer; behold the devil shall cast some of you into prison. . . . Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a Crown of life." The aged Bishop Polycarp being at once sought for was persuaded by his friends to seek a refuge first in one village, and then in another, till his place of concealment was divulged by two slaves under the influence of torture. Even then Polycarp might if he had chosen have escaped; but he refused to do so, saying with calm submission, "God's Will be done." A full and interesting account of his martyrdom is given in a circular letter, written by the Church of Smyrna to their brethren of the Churches of Asia, and preserved by Eusebius. As he entered the Arena a voice was heard, though no one was seen who spoke it, "Be strong, Polycarp, and quit thyself like a man." In vain the Proconsul urged him; "Reverence thy old age; swear by the genius of Cæsar . . . revile Christ, and I will set thee at liberty." "Four-score and six years," was his

reply, "have I now served Christ, and He has never done me the least wrong ; how then can I blaspheme my King and my Saviour ?"

The Proconsul next threatened him with the wild beasts, and when this was ineffectual, threatened to consign him to the flames. "You threaten me," said Polycarp, "with fire which burns for an hour and is easily extinguished ; but knowest not the fire of the future judgment, nor of the eternal punishment of the ungodly." The herald thrice proclaimed that Polycarp had confessed himself a Christian. The multitude clamoured for his death, and demanded that he should be thrown to the lions. But the games being now ended, they next demanded that he should be burnt alive. When they were about to fasten him to the stake, Polycarp assured them that it was unnecessary, for God would give him grace to stand firm without such security. When he had given hearty thanks to God for having vouchsafed to number him amongst the Martyrs, and to drink the cup of Christ, the wood was at once kindled ; but the flames swept round him like the sail of a ship, and a sweet perfume, as of frankincense or aromatic herbs, was exhaled from his body. When it was seen that his body could not be consumed by fire, the executioner plunged his sword into his side, from which gushed forth blood sufficient to extinguish the flames. The martyrdom being at length effected, the Jews requested that the body should be consumed by fire, lest the Christians should forsake the Crucified Jesus and worship Polycarp. The Christians afterwards collected the few bones that remained, "more precious than the richest jewels, and tried above gold," and deposited them in a fitting place ; and the day of his martyrdom was commemorated, not as the day of his death, but the birthday of eternal life.

In the year 174 occurred what is known as the miracle of the *Thundering Legion*. Whilst the Roman army was engaged in war against some German tribes, and was suffering in a country

without water, and, under the rays of a parching sun, from a severe drought, it was exposed to danger of a formidable attack from the enemy. A legion composed of Christians knelt down and implored the help of God. Suddenly an abundant shower of rain relieved the necessities of the Christians, whilst at the same time a violent storm, accompanied with lightning, discomfited their enemies; and thus an easy victory was gained by the Romans. That there is some substratum of truth in the narrative is well supported by history. But against its literal acceptation must be placed the improbability that a whole legion was composed of Christian soldiers; whilst the title borne by the Thundering Legion is as old as the time of Augustus. Whilst the Christians ascribed the miracle to their God, the Roman soldiers attributed it to the Pagan gods. It led to no mitigation of the persecution. So far from this being the case, towards the end of the reign of Aurelius (A.D. 177), so terrible a persecution befell the Churches of Vienne and Lyons in the South of France, that they seemed in danger of being utterly annihilated.

We have no certain information as to when and by whom Christianity was first introduced into Gaul. Massilia (the ancient name of Marseilles, the first settlement in Gallic soil), was founded by the Phocæans, circ. B.C. 600; and in the time of Julius Cæsar it was a city of considerable importance. Christians may have migrated thither in the early days of Christianity, and amongst those whom tradition reports to have gone there are Martha and Mary, and their brother Lazarus. Whether St. Paul visited Spain, in which case he would probably have visited Gaul, is, as has been before mentioned, a matter of doubt. Crescens was sent by St. Paul into Galatia (2 Tim. iv. 10), but whether Cisalpine or Transalpine Gaul is meant, cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. The Church of Arles claimed a precedence on the ground of its having been founded by Trophimus the Ephesian. Dionysius

the Areopagite is thought by some to have been influential in the conversion of Gaul; this, however, probably arose from a confusion between him and Dionysius, the first Bishop of Paris, who lived in the reign of Decius, and who is revered as the patron Saint of France under the name of St. Denys.

All that is known for certain is that a few scattered Churches, notably those of Vienne and Lyons, were founded in Gaul, in the middle of the second century, by missionaries sent by St. Polycarp from Asia Minor, under St. Pothinus, who became Bishop of Lyons, and the young Irenæus, who was at first a Presbyter under Pothinus, and on the martyrdom of the latter succeeded him in the Bishopric.

The sufferings of the Martyrs of Vienne and Lyons are recorded in a letter, probably written by St. Irenæus, to the Christians of Asia and Phrygia. Search was made for the Christians, and some heathen slaves who were in their service accused their masters of eating human flesh like Thyestes, and of incestuous marriage, like Œdipus; the charges arising out of the celebration of the Eucharist, and a mistaken idea of the Agape or Love Feast.

The most inhuman tortures which it is scarcely possible to imagine, and which it would be unprofitable to describe, were inflicted on the Christians, who, when these were of no avail, were put to barbarous deaths. But their courage and patient endurance only encouraged others to follow their examples, and many who had been at first terrified into sacrificing, imitated their companions, and were themselves led to glorify God by their deaths.

The most important amongst the victims was the venerable Bishop Pothinus himself, a man already broken down by prolonged illness, and sinking under the weight of ninety-six years. Being dragged before the Governour and asked, "Who is the God of the Christians?" he replied (in order not to give him the means of blaspheming), "If thou art worthy, thou shalt know."

After this, having been dragged about, and unmercifully beaten and stoned by the mob, and scourged by the officers, he was cast, in an almost lifeless condition, into prison, where he died in two days.

A female slave named Biblis, who had at first been frightened into abjuration, was reclaimed to the faith which she had abjured, and, regardless of the tortures to which she was subjected, remained faithful to death.

Amongst the victims were Sanctus, a Deacon of Vienne, Maturus, a recent convert, Attalus, a Confessor and native of Pergamus ; and, memorable beyond all from the amount of suffering which she, almost superhumanly, endured, a female slave named Blandina. She was of so delicate a constitution that her mistress, herself a martyr, was full of apprehension lest her courage should fail and she should abjure the faith. Every kind of torment which the executioners, who constantly relieved each other in the task night and day, could contrive, was resorted to, till they themselves, tired of their work, declared they had no further torments in reserve ; all they could wring from her was, "I am a Christian, and no wickedness exists amongst us." We need not describe the cruelties inflicted on her. Regardless of her own sufferings, she encouraged the fortitude of a youth of fifteen, named Ponticus, who died under the torture. She herself rejoiced in the prospect of approaching death, and after having been tossed by a bull, was eventually despatched by the sword of the executioner. The bodies of the martyrs were thrown to the dogs ; their bones were carefully watched day and night, lest the Christians should give them burial, and were afterwards cast into the river Rhone, the Pagans fancying thus to frustrate all hope of a Resurrection.

When we read of the terrible sufferings of the Christians in this and other persecutions, the thought for a moment comes over us, whether those early martyrs could have been men and women of the same mould and senses, and affections as ourselves, and

whether some more than human power must not have been given them, to enable them to give up everything for their Faith, and to endure tortures, which, had they not been related by eye-witnesses, it would have been thought impossible for humanity to inflict, or for human nature to endure.

Although the time and the agency of the first introduction of the Gospel into Britain must remain a matter of uncertainty, it is probable that a considerable increase and spread of Christianity in this country occurred during this persecution.

Some attribute the introduction of Christianity into Britain to Apostolic times, and even to the Apostles themselves. It can scarcely be doubted, since Britain was a Province of the Roman Empire, and there were roads laid down with consummate skill, connecting the most extreme parts of the Empire, along which Roman soldiers and merchants were constantly passing, that individual Christians must have existed in Britain early in the First Century. But as to there being anything which could be called a Church, evidence is too vague to found on it any historical fact. It is, perhaps, worthy of a passing remark, that at the very time that the Gallican persecution occurred, Eleutherius (177—190) succeeded to the See of Rome; that a legend prevailed that Lucius, a king of Britain, sent two messengers to him, requesting instruction in the Gospel, and that his pious request was granted. The conversion of Lucius was the consequence, and the conversion of the king soon swelled into that of the whole country. The legend is open to suspicion on account of the lateness of its origin, and also from the absence of any knowledge that such a king as Lucius ever existed. We only mention it for what it is worth, and that perhaps is very little.

Still it would appear that in the last quarter of the Second Century, Christianity did gain a considerable footing in Britain. For whereas St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, writing about A.D. 176, knew of no Church in Britain, Tertullian, who wrote some twenty years afterwards, speaks of "British districts . . . being subjected

to Christ." The Britons belonged to the same Celtic race as the Gauls, and the persecution under Aurelius did not reach Britain. In what country were these persecuted Christians of Gaul so likely to seek refuge as in a friendly country, amongst their neighbours of the same Celtic family as themselves? Tertullian likens the Christians to grass, the more it is mown, the thicker it grows. It would only be in accordance with the maxim, that the blood of the Martyrs is the seed of the Church, if by the time he wrote, the Gospel had spread in Britain by means of these Gallican converts. There might not have been, and there probably was not, any wide-spread extension of the Gospel; and Origen, who wrote twenty years later, says that the *greater* part of Britain had not in his time received the Gospel.

St. Irenæus, whose name is derived from a Greek word (εἰρήνη) signifying peace, succeeded the martyr St. Pothinus in the Bishopric of Lyons, over which he presided nearly twenty-five years. During their persecution, the Gallican Christians, alarmed at the progress of Montanism, drew up a letter to Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, which they despatched by Irenæus; and to this circumstance is attributable his immunity from persecution, and probably from martyrdom.

Montanism was a form of Christianity which sprung up at the end of the reign of Aurelius, inculcating a morbid asceticism, beyond what the laws of the Church prescribed, and deriving its name from Montanus a native of Phrygia, whence his followers, who were generally called after him Montanists, were sometimes called Phrygians or Cataphrygians. Montanus was accused of calling himself the Paraclete. This, however, does not appear to be literally true. What he held was that the promise of the Comforter was not confined to Apostolic times, but that its fulfilment was incomplete and gradual; that he himself was under the immediate Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and was specially privileged to declare new revelations to the Church, a similar illumination being extended to his two female votaries,

Maximilla and Priscilla. Two other female disciples who were attracted to him were the future Martyrs, Perpetua and Felicitas. He foretold the speedy advent of Christ, and a millennium, of which Pepuza, a village in Phrygia, was to be the Metropolis.

The Montanists, who caused much trouble in the Church, received the Old and New Testaments, and were orthodox on the doctrine of the Trinity. But they laid claim for themselves to a greater sanctity and superior light to what was vouchsafed to other Christians; they observed more frequent and vigorous fasts; they encouraged celibacy, and regarded marriage as a necessary evil, but second marriages they wholly condemned; martyrdom was not to be avoided by flight; they refused communion, even after their repentance, to those who fell into sin after Baptism. Although holding all the doctrines of the Church they separated from it, and formed a schism, their most influential adherent being Tertullian, who after he joined them became a bitter opponent to the Church, and gave them a celebrity which they would not otherwise have possessed.

During the episcopate of Irenæus, whilst Victor I. was Bishop of Rome (190—202), the Paschal controversy was renewed. Victor thought to enforce the Western observance of Easter on the Eastern Churches, and wrote to them to that effect, under pain of excommunication. The Asiatic Churches through Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, refused to alter their custom, and Victor accordingly excommunicated them. Irenæus, although his own practice at Lyons was in accordance with that of Victor, wrote to the Bishop of Rome in the cause of peace and union, advocating a diversity in a matter not affecting the essentials of the Church, and referring to the friendly difference between Anicetus and Polycarp; and through his mediation peace was restored. The time for keeping Easter was not finally settled till the Council of Nice, A.D. 325.

St. Irenæus wrote several works in Greek in defence of the Church against heretical sects, especially the Valentinians, the

followers of a celebrated Gnostic, named Valentinus, who flourished in the reign of Antoninus Pius. Tertullian speaks of Irenæus as "a most diligent explorer of all kinds of learning." He died about A.D. 202; some suppose he suffered martyrdom under Septimius Severus; but this is doubtful.

Between the time of Ignatius, who, as we have seen, recognised in his Epistles no superiority attaching to the Bishop of Rome, and the time of St. Irenæus, a marked difference is observable in the position of the Roman See. The glory of Jerusalem, the mother-Church of Christianity, had, since the fall of the city, waned. Under a feeling of the necessity for some centre of Christianity, a gravitation to Rome, as the capital of the Roman Empire, and as containing the tombs of SS. Peter and Paul, set in. Irenæus, in giving the succession of the Bishops of Rome remarks, that "to *this* Church every Church must come," assigning to its Bishop a primacy, although not jurisdiction, over other Churches, "on account of the superior principality;" i.e. from Rome being the capital of the Roman Empire. The Clementine fiction had now done its work, as shown in the haughty bearing of Victor; and the Bishop of Rome began to assert his supremacy as successor to St. Peter. In the matter of the Easter controversy Victor had *right* on his side; still St. Irenæus does not hesitate to remonstrate with him on the severity of his conduct, and his jurisdiction over them was not acknowledged by the other Churches of Christendom.

The death of Aurelius, though a loss to the State, was a gain to the Church, and no general persecution is recorded during the reign of his unworthy successor, his son Commodus (180—192), who so degraded the imperial dignity as to lower himself to the profession, hitherto confined to slaves and barbarians, of a common gladiator. Yet, though he himself practised the grossest impiety and sensuality, Eusebius says that the Church throughout the whole world enjoyed peace and tranquillity. This was said to be due to his favourite mistress, Marcia, who,

if she herself did not belong to them, was well disposed to the Christians, and through her influence those who in the former reign were condemned to the mines of Syria, were recalled to Rome. The old statutes, however, remained unrepealed, and there were plenty of willing victims for martyrdom; "Wretches," said Antoninus, a Proconsul of Asia, "if ye wish to die, ye have got rocks and ropes ready for your purpose."

Some martyrdoms, however, are recorded in this reign, the most important being that of Apollonius, a Roman Senator, a man distinguished for learning and philosophy; a proof, independent of the testimony of Eusebius, that Christianity was now embraced by persons of high distinction in the State. He was beheaded on the accusation of his slave, and the fact that the accuser also suffered death, shows that the law against informers, passed under Hadrian, was still in force.

To account for the general immunity of the Christians, we may suppose that the wicked Emperor was too absorbed in his vices to have time to bestow upon the Christians. His vices, however, proved fatal to him. He had shed the blood of one of the noblest men in the Empire, and no one knew but that his own turn might come next. His mistress Marcia mixed poison with his wine; and whilst he was sleeping under the effects of poison and drunkenness, he was strangled by a man who was by profession a wrestler; and in the same night the throne of the Roman Empire was conferred on the virtuous Pertinax, a man who in every position which he had occupied had shown himself worthy of his new dignity. But amidst the general joy which greeted his election, there was a party in Rome which dreaded his strict discipline, and regretted the license they had enjoyed under Commodus; and by them he was murdered on March 28, 193, eighty-six days after his accession.

The mode in which his successor was elected marks the degenerate spirit of the Romans and the decline of the Roman Empire; the Empire was thrown open to the highest bidder,

and was purchased by Didius Julianus a wealthy Senator. This ignominious disposal of the Empire by public auction was received with wide-spread indignation and horror, and the new Emperor soon found himself without an adherent or a friend. Septimius Severus marched at the head of an army against Rome; Didius was on June 2 of the year of his accession deposed, and executed by order of the Senate; and Septimius Severus (193—211) once more united the Empire under his rule.

His two short-lived predecessors had no time, amid the troubles which beset the State, to devote to the Christians, and no mention of them occurs during their reigns. The new Emperor had a strong tendency to superstition, which boded ill for the Christians, and from being at first the protector, he afterwards became the bitter persecutor, of Christianity. Having been at the commencement of his reign cured of a malady through oil administered by a Christian named Proculus, (this was perhaps done in obedience to the injunction of St. James (James v. 14) for the recovery of the sick), he allowed the Christians favour and distinction at his court, and appointed a Christian nurse for his infant son Caracalla.

The Third Century was ushered in by a new persecution. Passing through Asia and the East, the Emperor came in contact with the violent fanaticism of the Montanists who abounded in those countries, one of whose crotchets was that the end of the world and of the Roman Empire was at hand. Alarmed at such sinister predictions, and confusing the Montanists with the general body of Christians, he issued an edict forbidding any of his subjects to embrace either Judaism or Christianity. So violent a persecution, especially in Africa, where Christianity had struck a deep root, ensued, and lasted till the end of his reign, that the Christians believed the reign of Anti-Christ had set in. It broke out in Egypt, and nowhere did it rage so fiercely as in Alexandria. There Leonidas, the father of the famous Origen, was amongst the victims, Origen

himself, a youth of sixteen, encouraging his father to perseverance; "Take heed, my Father," he said, "that you do not change out of regard to us;" and he himself was with difficulty restrained by his mother from offering to share his father's martyrdom.

Famous amongst the African Martyrs were two females of Carthage, Perpetua, a wealthy married lady of noble family, and a married slave named Felicitas, who gave birth to a child in prison. Perpetua, who was only twenty-two years of age, with an infant in her arms, together with Felicitas, and their youthful fellow-prisoners, Revocatus, Saturninus, and Secundulus, were all Catechumens. The chief interest centres round Perpetua, a Saint whose name is commemorated in the English Calendar. In prison she suffered greatly from the darkness, the heated atmosphere, and the crowded accommodation. In vain her father, himself a pagan, implored her again and again, even using threats, to renounce the Faith; "I cannot," she said, "call myself by any other name than Christian." They were all baptized in prison; the water of Baptism, Perpetua said, seemed to give strength to her body. Secundulus died in prison. Shortly before the trial, her father again visited her, and bade her take pity on his old age, and to consider the disgrace her death as a malefactor would inflict on the family. Even the judge entreated her to take pity on her infant and her father, and to offer sacrifice; she firmly declared that she was a Christian and could not sacrifice to false gods. At these words the father uttered such loud and bitter cries, that the judge ordered him to be removed from court and beaten with rods. This was to her the bitterest trial of all; she felt every blow, she said, as if it had been inflicted on her own body. The birthday of Geta, one of the sons of the Emperor, was the day appointed for the execution, to which they were all led forth from prison, Perpetua singing Psalms on the way. The young men were cast to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre; Perpetua and Felicitas having

been first put into nets and thrown before a furious cow, were at last despatched by the sword of the executioner, Perpetua herself directing against her breast the blow of the young and inexperienced gladiator. The gaoler was so struck with the patience and fortitude of his prisoners, that he himself became a convert to Christianity.

It was probably at the commencement of the persecution of Severus that Tertullian (circ. 160—230) wrote his famous *Apology*. Beyond that he was a native of Carthage, the son of a Proconsular Centurion, little is known of his early life. He was probably a Pagan by birth, converted to Christianity about A.D. 196. When a married man, he was ordained a Presbyter, and became for a time a powerful literary defender of the Church; but he had only been in Holy Orders a few years, before he fell into Montanism. His habitually austere and ascetic character, and his impatient temper, added to the jealousy and ill-treatment of the Roman clergy, may account for his adoption of the rigid principles of the new sect. Hitherto the Greek language had been, even in Rome itself, the ordinary medium of communication in commerce and literature, St. Clement, though Bishop of Rome, himself writing in that language. Latin, however, had lately become a familiar language, and it is worthy of remark that Tertullian, though a native of Africa, was the first Father of the Church who wrote in the Latin language. Tertullian was one of the greatest, if not the very greatest, of the uninspired authors whom the Church had known; he is said to have been the first writer who used the word *Trinity*, and *Persons* with regard to the Godhead. St. Cyprian was his great admirer, and called him his 'master,' and never passed a day without reading some of his writings.

His chief work, the *Apology* or Defence of the Christians, in which he exposed the unjust treatment to which they were subjected, if somewhat vehement and unsympathetic, and

breathing out, not so much supplication for the Christians, as scorn and contempt for their adversaries, is nevertheless considered for its elegance and irrefragable logic, to take the first place amongst the Christian Apologies. He says, that the magistrates make Christianity a crime because they do not understand its nature; that the Christians, although they could not recognise the Emperor as god, yet were good subjects, and held his person as sacred, and pray to God for him; that their lives compared favourably with those of the heathens; and that it was vain for the heathens to war against God, for that Christianity will endure as long as the Roman Empire, and the duration of the Empire will be coeval with that of the world.

The persecution ended with, or shortly after, the death of Severus, which occurred at York on February 4, A.D. 211. He was succeeded by his two sons, who cordially hated each other, Caracalla (211—217) and Geta, who reigned together till Geta was on February 27, A.D. 212, murdered with the connivance of Caracalla, who had only been prevented from becoming a parricide through the soldiers refusing to join the attempt on his father's life. Caracalla, though a madman, and a monster who was a disgrace to human nature, refrained from persecuting the Church. This might be owing to his having been brought up by a Christian nurse (*lacte Christiano educatus*), but the more probable reason is that he was too much occupied by his vices to have time to trouble himself about any religion. At any rate the Christians enjoyed for some time comparative security, and began to live down the suspicions which attached to their name.

Caracalla having been murdered on March 11, A.D. 217, was succeeded by the instigator of the murder, Macrinus, who after a short reign of two months was followed by the profligate sun-worshipper, Elagabalus (218—222), a name derived from a Syrian appellation of the Sun. He also was too much occupied by the eccentricities of his own worship, and the multiplicity of his vices, to concern himself with the Christians.

The next Emperor was Alexander Severus (222—235), a youth only seventeen years of age at the time of his accession, so that for some time his mother, Mammæa, was regent of the Empire, and to the last exercised an absolute, and on the whole a wise, control over him. Mammæa although accused by heathen writers of avarice (*auri atque argenti cupida*), is described by Eusebius as “a most devout (Θεοσεβεστανή) woman.” Under her precept and example, the mind of the young Emperor, which though somewhat weak was naturally mild and gentle, and combined with fine abilities, imbibed a love of virtue and aversion to vice. Though Mammæa was not herself a Christian, she studied their doctrines, showed respect for Christian teachers, and when she was with her son at Alexandria, sent for Origen to instruct her. The Emperor also admired the moral excellence of Christianity; but his religion assumed an eclectic form, and in his own chapel he made an incongruous combination of a bust of Christ with those of Abraham and Orpheus. But when some tavern-keepers at Rome laid claim to a house which the Christians used as a Church, the Emperor decided the matter in favour of the Christians, not from any preference to their religion, but on the ground that any form of religious worship was preferable to its being used as a tavern. There is reason for believing that though he never became a Christian, and his own religion was strangely marked with superstition, yet in his heart he inclined more to Christianity than to heathenism. Certain it is, that under him a great advance was made; for whereas the Christian assemblies had hitherto been held in private houses, a public recognition of Christianity was now permitted; Churches were built and allowed to hold endowments, and the Emperor appointed Christians to positions in his household, and received Bishops officially at his court.

Alexander, together with Mammæa, was murdered, A.D. 235, in an insurrection under Maximin, a Thracian, who succeeded him as Emperor (235—238). Hatred of Alexander and of the

favour which he had shown the Christians, was sufficient reason to turn his barbarian successor against Christianity. Earthquakes also, which at this time destroyed several cities, stimulated the animosity of the populace against the Christians, to whom they were attributed. The leaders of the Church were the especial objects of persecution; churches were destroyed; several Christians who formed part of the household of Alexander suffered death, and many others were martyred.

The persecution, however, was neither one of extreme violence nor of long duration, being cut short by the early death of the usurper. His successor Gordian (238—244), who was only nineteen years of age, was favourable to the Christians, whilst the next Emperor, Philip the Arabian (244—249), has been claimed as the first Christian Emperor. This, however, is not supported by sufficient evidence to command our assent. For, though he and his wife Severa were undoubtedly well disposed to the Christians, and corresponded with the great Christian teacher, Origen, yet his Christianity is refuted by the heathen ceremonies with which he commemorated the thousandth anniversary (A.D. 247) of the foundation of Rome.

Philip having been killed in a rebellion was succeeded by his victor, Decius (249—251). The short period of peace which the Church had enjoyed had proved more fatal to it than the sword of the executioner; and persecution had been less dangerous than security. The Christians were now a recognised body in the community; churches had been built in various parts of the Empire, and in some places the pagan temples and idols had been destroyed.

But the zeal which had characterised the Church in adversity deserted it during the period of comparative peace. Whilst its numbers had increased, its character had degenerated. It now enrolled amongst its members many of the higher classes of society; but both St. Cyprian and Origen have drawn a lamentable picture of its condition. The level of piety was

lowered, and the simplicity which had marked the character of the early Christians relaxed. The devotion of the laity had grown languid, and the love of ease and pleasure prevailed. The higher clergy were luxurious and worldly-minded; the lower clergy covetous and remiss in their duties; and the unguarded intimacy between the clergy and virgins of the African Church, if not criminal, at any rate laid them open to suspicion. It was at such a time that the persecution under Decius, the severest and most widely-extended which the Church had as yet encountered, broke out. Instigated by hatred of his predecessor, Decius resolved to thoroughly exterminate Christianity. The first step taken by him was to issue an intolerant decree to the provincial governours to make search for the Christians, whom any popular clamour was sufficient to condemn, whilst any false accuser escaped with impunity. The test applied was the willingness of the Christians to offer sacrifice. Every kind of torture with the most exquisite cruelties was resorted to. A universal panic prevailed. The ordinary laws which govern society and bind man and man together, were dissolved. No Christian was safe; friend betrayed friend, brother denounced brother, the father informed against the son and the son against the father. Families were dissolved, and sought refuge in the deserts. The prisons, and when these were not sufficient, private houses, were filled with victims. The persecution was particularly directed against the Heads of the Church. In the West, Fabian, Bishop of Rome (236—251), was amongst the martyrs, whilst in the East, Babylas, Bishop of Antioch, and Alexander of Jerusalem, died in prison.

Origen, who was at the time living at Alexandria, was called upon to bear testimony to the faith. Born at Alexandria about A.D. 185, and educated under the famous Clemens Alexandrinus and Ammonius Saccas, the founder of Neoplatonism, (an eclectic system which aimed at combining the philosophy of Plato with the doctrines of the Bible), Origen (as before mentioned), when

seventeen years of age, lost his father Leonidas, who was not only martyred but deprived of his property, through which loss he and his mother and her six other children were reduced to extreme poverty. He however found a friend in a rich lady of Alexandria; and at the early age of eighteen was appointed by the Bishop Demetrius, Head of the Catechetical School of that city. That famous school, the foundation of which was by some ascribed to St. Mark, owed its origin to the care which the early Church bestowed in preparing Catechumens for Confirmation. It afterwards became a college for the Clergy, and of higher education for the laity, its course of study extending from the most fundamental truths of Christianity to the highest range of intellectual thought, especially the philosophy of Plato, by which it was imagined opponents of Christianity might be met. Its first head was Pantæus, a converted Stoic philosopher, who was said to be the most learned man of the time, and who afterwards became a missionary in India. Clemens, who from his birth-place was styled Alexandrinus, was at first an assistant, and eventually succeeded Pantæus in the Mastership; he was followed by Origen, amongst whose pupils was Heraclas, who afterwards became Bishop of Alexandria.

Origen when on a visit to the Holy Land was, at the age of forty-three, ordained Priest by two Bishops who were his friends, Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem, and the Bishop of Cæsarea. But the ordination of Origen was irregular on account of his having in his youth, from an exaggerated idea of a passage in the Gospels (Matt. xix. 12), mutilated himself, thereby incapacitating himself for the Priesthood. His ordination, as well as the freedom of his speculations, and, it was believed, envy of his talents, subjected him to the wrath of his own Bishop, Demetrius. Finding his position at Alexandria unbearable, he sought a residence in Cæsarea. Demetrius then assembled two Synods at Alexandria, by which Origen was deposed from the Catechetical

School, his Orders were annulled, and he himself was excommunicated; and the sentence remained unchanged under Heraclas, who (A.D. 233) succeeded Demetrius in the See of Alexandria, and also under his successor in the See, Dionysius, another of Origen's pupils.

At Cæsarea Origen delivered lectures in philosophy and literature, which were crowded with pupils, both Christian and heathen, amongst the latter being Gregory, called also Theodore, a native of Neo-Cæsarea, who under the teaching of Origen was led to embrace Christianity. Gregory was afterwards appointed Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea at a time when only fifteen Christians resided there; numerous converts, however, were soon made through the zealous labours of, and, it was said, the miracles performed by, Gregory, which gained for him the title of Gregory Thaumaturgus (the miracle-worker).

During the Decian persecution, Origen, then almost seventy years of age, was thrown into prison, where he was treated with great cruelty, his neck made fast in an iron collar, and his body daily stretched on the rack. He, however, survived the reign of Decius, dying immediately afterwards from the effects of his treatment, thus gaining the crown, not of a Martyr but of a Confessor to the Faith.

The amount of his literary work was incalculable. His greatest work was doubtless the *Hexapla*, which derived its name from the six parallel columns of various translations of the Bible, under which it is arranged; a work which is said to have occupied him twenty-eight years, and which justly earned for him the title of Father of Biblical Criticism.

The one absorbing object of his life was to reconcile Christianity with philosophy, especially that of Plato. His life-long opposition to heresy, the number of converts whom he reconciled to the Church, are enough to exonerate him from intentional heresy; yet his allegorical interpretations of the Bible, and errors due to his Platonic predilections, caused his memory to be

branded by posterity, and placed him under the permanent ban of the Church.

Under the strain put upon them by the Decian persecution, many Christians fell away. In the days of its prosperity, many persons had joined the Church without counting the cost, and under the fear of torture and confiscation of their goods had *lapsed*, and the cause of the lapsed (*lapsi*) now, after the persecution ceased, caused great trouble to the Church. Of the lapsed there were three classes. The most deeply criminal were those who had offered sacrifice to the heathen gods (*sacrificati*). A scarcely less criminal class were those who had offered incense (*thurificati*). A third class consisted of those who had purchased certificates of having complied with the Emperor's decree (*libellatici*). These last were received back into the Church on easier terms than the two other classes.

About the same time as Origen, lived St. Cyprian (circ. 200—258), the second writer after Tertullian in the Carthaginian Church, or, as some think, the first. Thasius Cæcilius Cyprian (the second of which names he assumed after a Presbyter at Carthage who was influential in his conversion) was born of wealthy parents at or near Carthage. Of his early life little is known, beyond that he was a Professor of logic and rhetoric at Carthage. Having been, at the age of forty-five, converted to Christianity, he abandoned his profession and a life of affluence, selling the greater part of his possessions for distribution amongst the poor. Having been ordained Presbyter, he was, much against his will, chosen (A.D. 248) Bishop of Carthage, one of the few Presbyters who opposed his election being a man of evil notoriety, named Novatus.

Cyprian, who as an organiser has had few equals and no superior amongst Christian Bishops, at once applied himself with great success to revive the failing faith of his Diocese. Two years after he became Bishop, the Decian persecution broke out. He was immediately marked out for death; and the cry *Cyprian to*

the lions was heard on all sides; and Cyprian, pleading a divine command, sought a neighbouring refuge, from which he continued to administer the affairs of his diocese.

Returning after a year to Carthage, he found himself involved in a sea of troubles, arising out of the case of those who had *lapsed* during the Decian persecution. The heavy penance to which they were subjected was generally remitted on the production of letters granted them by the martyrs when they were on the point of death, requesting the re-admission of the lapsed penitents into the Church. Some of the bearers of these letters were true penitents, others insolently demanded their re-admission as a right. Cyprian, who had at one time been most rigorous with regard to the lapsed, now exercised his judgment with discretion and moderation. But he incurred the suspicion of two parties, one accusing him on the ground of his former strictness, the other as being now too lax in his discipline.

Novatus, probably the same Presbyter who had before opposed Cyprian's election, now did all in his power to oppose him. He had himself been in the habit of admitting the lapsed to Communion without their even undergoing the ordinary penance; with a view to annoying Cyprian he was now instrumental in getting Felicissimus, a wealthy man, but of indifferent character, ordained to the Diaconate. These two acting together incited the clergy, as well as a number of the lapsed, against Cyprian, and obtained the consecration by five Bishops, who had incurred the censures of the Church, of one Fortunatus, a known opponent of Cyprian, to the See of Carthage.

Novatus next proceeded to Rome, where he joined Novatian.

For some little time after the martyrdom of Fabian, no election (in consequence of the persecution) was made to the See of Rome; but eventually Cornelius (251—252) was elected. Novatian, far the superior of Cornelius in intellectual attainments, who had only received clinical Baptism (that is, Baptism on a sick bed, which unless afterwards completed was considered

a ban to Ordination), had notwithstanding been ordained a Presbyter by Fabian, without going through the lower Orders. He had exercised the greatest rigour with regard to the lapsed, refusing to receive them to Communion even on their death-beds. Novatus now, wishing to enlist him against Cyprian, adopted his rigorous views, and with his help Novatian contrived to be schismatically consecrated by three rural Bishops to the See of Rome.

But notwithstanding the intrigues which were set on foot against him, Cyprian succeeded in overcoming all opposition; the greater number of the lapsed, disgusted with the conduct of Novatus, renounced their allegiance to the schismatical Fortunatus, and peace was restored to the Diocese.

Shortly after the return of Cyprian, Carthage was overwhelmed with a plague of terrible violence, the dying and the dead lying unburied in the streets, avoided by their nearest relations, and the heathen population standing aloof. The Christians, under the direction of Cyprian, came to the rescue, the rich with their substance, the poor with their labour; many Christians who after the late persecution had been liberated from the prisons and the mines, who still bore on their bodies the marks of mutilation, exposing their lives for those who had so lately been their deadly enemies. Many of the heathen at first wondered at such acts of love from those whom they had considered their enemies; from wonder they turned to admiration, and ended by joining the Church.

Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, was martyred A.D. 252, and after the short Pontificate of Lucius I., who also suffered martyrdom, Stephen I. (253—257), a man of violent and assuming character, became Bishop of Rome. The Clementine Forgery was now in full working order, and the arrogance of Stephen gave a foretaste of its inevitable results.

With regard to an important question which sprung up at this time, Stephen and Cyprian were hopelessly at variance. At Rome Baptism conferred by heretics was considered valid, the persons

so baptized being afterwards received into the Church by imposition of hands. But in Asia and Africa re-baptism was the custom, on the ground that Baptism could only be conferred by the Church, and this view was sanctioned in Councils held at Carthage, A.D. 255 and 256, to which the African and Asiatic Churches generally assented. Cyprian observed great firmness in support of these Churches; Stephen denounced him in violent and arrogant language, branding him as "a false prophet," and broke off all communion with the African, as he had before with the Asiatic, Church. Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, protested against the pretension of the Roman Bishop, and told the Pope that he himself was the real schismatic, and that whilst thinking to excommunicate others, he had only excommunicated himself, and cut himself off from the Church.

Cyprian dealt with the Bishop of Rome as his colleague and equal; he had no doubt like others by that time been deceived by the Clementine fiction; but he represented to him that St. Peter though the first, was not of a higher order than the other Apostles; and though Cyprian in his writings spoke of Rome as "the chair and seat of St. Peter," and the principal See, yet in his dealings with Stephen he firmly maintained that the Bishop of Rome, though the first, was only the equal of other Bishops, and had no right to interfere in their Dioceses.

Stephen was right on the point of doctrine, and re-baptism was subsequently condemned in the Council of Arles (A.D. 314), which pronounced Baptism to be valid, if conferred by water "in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost."

In the matter of dealing with the lapsed, Stephen was at one with Cyprian. The Novatians, however, professing a stricter religion, and condemning the laxity of the Church, re-baptized their Proselytes, and refused Communion to those who fell into sin after Baptism. Assuming the name of *Cathari* or *Pure* (the forerunners of the Puritans of a later date), they continued to trouble the Church for more than three hundred years.

Decius having been slain in battle by the Goths (an ominous name, which now makes its appearance in the history of the Roman Empire) was succeeded as Emperor by Gallus (251—253); and on his assassination, Valerian (253—260), a man more than sixty years of age, succeeded to the Empire, associating his son Gallienus (253—268) in the government. Their reign was one of an unbroken series of calamities to the Roman Empire.

Valerian was at first so well disposed to the Church that his household was filled with Christians, and was compared by Eusebius to a Church of God. But in the fifth year of his reign, under the influence of his chief minister Macrianus, his conduct underwent a complete change. He issued edicts forbidding the Christians to assemble for worship; and soon afterwards a further edict, ordering Bishops, Priests, and Deacons to be put to death; Senators and other men of rank, if Christians, were to be deprived of their dignity and possessions, and if they still persisted in the faith, to be beheaded; and noble matrons were condemned to confiscation of their goods, and banishment. Stephen, Bishop of Rome, fell a Martyr in the first year of the persecution. Sixtus II. who followed him, was martyred in 258, together with his Archdeacon Laurence, who is represented as having been roasted to death over a slow fire. St. Cyprian was sentenced by the Governour of Africa to banishment at Curubis, a place about forty miles from Carthage, where he remained a year; but on the appointment of a new Governour he was brought back to Carthage, and on his refusal to sacrifice to the heathen gods was condemned to be beheaded, and died a Martyr A.D. 258.

To this persecution the legend of St. Ursula and the 11,000 Virgins, with which visitors to Cologne Cathedral are familiar, is by some attributed.

A powerful enemy to Rome had arisen in the East in the Persians, and Valerian, notwithstanding his advanced age, determined to march against their King Sapor. Macrianus,

who had urged him on to the persecution of the Christians, still remained his evil genius to the end ; and whilst he made the Emperor formidable only to his own subjects, he rendered him an object of contempt to his enemies. By his evil counsels the Roman army was betrayed into a situation where neither skill nor valour were of avail ; an overwhelming defeat was the consequence ; Valerian was taken prisoner, and made ignominiously to follow the triumphal procession of the conqueror. It is said that he was carried about in chains from place to place, and that whenever the Persian King mounted his horse, he placed his foot on the neck of the fallen Emperor ; and when Valerian died from grief and ignominy, his skin was stuffed with straw and preserved in a Persian Temple, to testify to future generations the defeat of Rome by the Persian arms. Gallienus was now left sole Emperor.

Gallienus, a man of effeminate and indolent disposition, who interested himself but little in the national religion of Rome, as soon as he became Emperor, out of no particular regard for Christianity, but in the interest of peace, put an end to the persecution, and issued the first edict for the toleration of Christianity ; the exiles were recalled from banishment, the free exercise of their religion allowed them, and Christianity now became a *licita* (lawful) religion.

Gallienus being murdered in a conspiracy, was succeeded by Claudius (268—270), and Claudius by Aurelian (270—275), and during the reign of the former, and the first four years of the latter, the Church enjoyed complete rest. But in his fifth year, the Emperor Aurelian, actuated by his superstitious worship of the Sun, and a consequent contempt of Christianity, issued an edict for the persecution of the Christians ; it was, however, averted by his death, and the edict was revoked by his successor Tacitus (275—276), the Church continuing to enjoy immunity from persecution till the reign of Diocletian (284—305).

By the time that Diocletian ascended the Imperial throne,

the seed, watered by the blood of the martyrs, had grown into a large tree. The recent persecutions had brought out the noblest traits of Christianity, and the innocent lives and the patient endurance of the sufferers, had long been preparing the way for the ultimate victory of the Church. Humanly speaking, the Christian Church could never have survived the dangers which it encountered. It was God's preordained plan, and His wise Will, that His Church should be refined in the furnace of affliction ; He had been gradually but surely preparing the way, and now at length the spiritual power was enabled to stand on its own resources. Christians were appointed to high offices in the State, and in the Imperial palace. Spacious churches with architectural adornments were erected ; gold and silver vessels were used in the office of the Eucharist ; persons of high station allowed not only their servants but their own children and wives to embrace Christianity, and the Empress Prisca, and her daughter Valeria, are said to have been Christians. The Church had attained a height which the State, though it might still persecute, could not arrest.

Such was the prosperous condition of the Church when the last and severest of all the persecutions broke out.

Diocletian, a man of mean birth, became Roman Emperor, A.D. 284, and proved one of the most illustrious of the number. In 286 he associated with himself in the Empire, Maximian, who was, like himself, a man of low birth. These two reigned as Augusti. The legend of the Theban Legion was at one time as universally believed, as it is now generally rejected. The legend, which is not older than the Sixth Century, is this. Maximian had brought with him from the East a legion called the Theban Legion. When, on his march to Gaul to suppress an insurrection in that country, he arrived at Martigny, he ordered the soldiers to offer sacrifice to the national gods, and on their repeated refusal he ordered them again and again to be decimated, till the whole legion was massacred.

Whatever truth or otherwise may attach to this record, Maximian, a man of a harsh and severe disposition, was imbued with a bitter hatred against the Christians; whilst Diocletian, a naturally gentle and humane man, was indifferent in his feelings towards them. Later on, Galerius, a man also of low birth, as well as of savage temper, who married Diocletian's daughter, and had inherited a deep hatred of the Christians; and Constantius, the superior in birth to his colleagues, who was well disposed towards them, were elected Emperors with the inferior rank of Cæsars. To Constantius the government of Spain, Gaul, and Britain was assigned.

Diocletian removed the seat of government from Rome to Nicomedia, a Town of Asia Minor, on the shore of what is now called the Sea of Marmora. Here he was visited by Galerius, who sedulously instigated him to the persecution of the Christians. Diocletian, who was averse to persecution, for a time resisted, but consented to consult the oracle of Apollo at Miletus. The answer was unfavourable to the Christians, and Diocletian was so alarmed that, having first caused the splendid church in Nicomedia to be destroyed, he in February (A.D. 303) issued an edict for the destruction of the churches and writings of the Christians (*τὰς γράφας*, their Scriptures and other books). No sooner was this order posted up, than it was torn down by a Christian, who paid the penalty of his rashness by being roasted alive over a slow fire, a punishment which he bore without uttering a groan. Twice the palace at Nicomedia was set on fire, the guilt being imputed to the Christians. Diocletian was now thoroughly incensed, and ordered his own wife to sacrifice; and many Christians, and amongst them Anthimus, Bishop of Nicomedia, were put to death. Fresh edicts were issued the same year; first, the Bishops and clergy, and next, the laity of every class (and their number in spite of the late persecutions had grown very large), were ordered, under pain of torture, to sacrifice; and the prisons were soon filled with victims.

We need not dwell on the tortures inflicted on the Christians ; they were but the repetition of former persecutions. But the churches were destroyed ; the gold and silver vessels, used in the services, carried away, and Bibles, wherever they could be found, cast into the flames. Rather than surrender the Scriptures, the Christians submitted to horrible tortures, and death itself ; those who surrendered them being branded as *Traditors* (*traditores*). It was the proud boast of Diocletian, that the very name of Christian was destroyed.

This was the only persecution which reached Britain. Constantius the Governour, well-disposed though he was to the Christians, could not altogether disobey the orders which were sent from Rome ; with which, however, as we are told, he only complied so far as to allow the churches, which could be rebuilt, to be destroyed, but “the true Temple of God, the human body, he preserved intact.” There is, however, no reason for doubting the reality of the martyrdom of St. Alban at Verulamium (the modern St. Alban’s), and of Aaron and Julius at Caerleon-on-Usk.

Stripped of the marvellous incidents recorded by Bede, the story of St. Alban, the Protomartyr of Britain, is briefly this. Alban, an officer of high rank in the army, had given shelter in his quarters at Verulamium to a Christian Priest, who was flying from persecution ; and on the hiding-place being discovered, Alban, who had meanwhile been converted by the Priest, assumed his cassock, and delivered himself up in his place to the Roman soldiers. Taken before the judge, and convicted on his own confession of being a Christian, and refusing to sacrifice, he suffered martyrdom on a beautiful hill outside the town, the soldier who was first appointed for his execution throwing away his sword, and preferring to die with him, rather than carry out the sentence.

Diocletian and Maximian (A.D. 305) abdicated the throne ; whereupon Galerius and Constantius became Augusti, Maximin,

the nephew of Galerius, and Severus becoming Cæsars. In 306 Constantius died at York, and was succeeded by his son Constantine, as Cæsar. In 307 Maximian resumed the purple. After several contentions and changes, Rome settled into the Government, or rather misgovernment, of six Emperors at one time, Maximian, his son Maxentius, Galerius, Maximin, Constantine, and Licinius.

CHAPTER IV.

ATHANASIUS CONTRA MUNDUM.

EARLY Life of Constantine—Becomes Emperor—Battle of the Milvian Bridge—Edict for Toleration of the Christians—Second Edict from Milan—Favours the Christian Church—Battle of Adrianople—Story of the Vision of the Cross—Donatism—Council of Arles—The Circumcelliones—Controversies on the Trinity—Praxeas—The Monarchians or Patripassians—Noetus—Sabellius—Dionysius of Alexandria and Dionysius of Rome—Paul of Samosata—The Meletian Schism—The Arian Heresy—Account of Arius—Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria—Council of Nice—First mention of Athanasius—Nicene Creed—Arius banished—Pilgrimage of Constantine's mother Helena to Palestine—Constantine's murder of his son Crispus—And of his wife Fausta—Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria—Recall of Arius—Dedication of New Rome or Constantinople—Becomes the Seat of Government—Advantage gained by Old Rome—Jealousy between the Bishops of Old and New Rome—First Banishment of Athanasius—Constantine baptized in the last year of his life by the Arian Bishop Eusebius—His munificence to Churches—Union of Church and State—Succeeded by his three sons—Synod of Antioch—Second Banishment of Athanasius—Council of Sardica—Foundation laid of Rome's appellate Jurisdiction—Athanasius returns from his eight years' banishment—Death of the Emperor Constant—The Arian Constantius sole Augustus—The Arian heresy for a time accepted by Hosius and Liberius, Bishop of Rome—Third Exile of Athanasius—Arian divisions—The Homoiousians, Anomæans, and Acacians—The Dated Creed—Councils of Sileucia and Rimini—Death of Constantius—Hilary of Poitiers—British Bishops—Julian called the Apostate, Emperor—His sanction to the Jews to rebuild Jerusalem—How frustrated—Return, and Fourth Exile of Athanasius—Jovian Emperor—Return of Athanasius—The Emperors Valentinian and Valens—Fifth Banishment of Athanasius—His return and death.

CONSTANTINE (274—337), afterwards surnamed the Great, was probably born at Naissus in Dacia. His mother Helena is said to have been the daughter of a Bithynian innkeeper; the story that she was the daughter of a British nobleman living at Colchester seems to be untrue, for the reason that Constantius was probably never in Britain till A.D. 306. When Constantine was eighteen years of age, his father divorced Helena, thereby

involving Constantine for a time in his mother's humiliation and obscurity. He is described as being of a tall and majestic figure, a consummate General, intrepid in war, but kindly and affable in peace; his conduct was regulated by the dictates of reason and prudence, whilst his mind, though engrossed by ambition, was proof against the temptation of vice, and even pleasure. Instead of accompanying his father, when the latter was appointed to the government of Spain, Gaul, and Britain, he served for some time in the army of Diocletian, and so gained the affection of the soldiers, that he became an object of jealousy to Galerius, to avoid the consequences of which he escaped to Gaul by a precipitate flight by night, just as his father was on the point of leaving that country for Britain. On his father's death, which occurred soon afterwards, Constantine was elevated, as was seen at the end of the last chapter, to the rank of Cæsar. Up to that time he had been a zealous follower of the heathen deities, especially of his tutelary god, Apollo. Eusebius tells us that for some time he was divided as to whether or not he should embrace Christianity, when God intervened by a miraculous phenomenon (as will soon be related) to turn him to Christianity.

On the death of his first wife Minervina, the mother of his son Crispus, Constantine, A.D. 307, married Fausta, the daughter of Maximian, and consequently sister of Maxentius. By her he had three daughters and three sons, Constantine, Constantius, and Constans, all of whom succeeded him as joint Emperors. We must now resume the thread of our history.

Such a state of things, as six Emperors of Rome reigning together, was not likely to be of long duration. Maximian died (it was supposed by his own hand) at Marseilles, A.D. 310. In 311 the cruel Galerius, smitten with a loathsome disease, similar to that which had carried off King Agrippa, issued in the joint names of himself, Constantine, and Licinius, an edict for toleration of the Christians, with permission to rebuild their churches;

imploing at the same time their prayers for his recovery. In that year he died.

On October 28, A.D. 312, Constantine defeated in a battle near Rome Maxentius, who whilst crossing in his flight the Milvian Bridge, was drowned in the Tiber. The battle of the Milvian Bridge decided the fate of Paganism, and in commemoration of the victory the Arch at Rome which bears the name of Constantine was erected.

On May 1, A.D. 313, Licinius, who had just before married Constantine's half-sister, Constantia, defeated in battle Maximin, the cruellest of all the persecutors; Maximin then issued an edict of toleration, but ended his life by suicide at Tarsus, dying with a pitiful appeal to the mercy of the Saviour. Thus there were only two Emperors left, Constantine and Licinius, the former ruling in the West, the latter in the East.

After the victory of Licinius over Maximin, the two Emperors issued, A.D. 313, in their joint names, an edict to put an end to the persecution. In the same year they issued another edict from Milan granting a *universal* toleration (*et Christianis et omnibus liberam potestatem sequendi religionem quam quisque voluisset*); and performing an act of justice to the Christians, by ordering the restoration of the churches and property of which they had been deprived by Diocletian, those who were in possession receiving compensation from the public purse. At the same time Constantine showed his favour to the Christians by making a special grant to the African Churches; the reason of this we are told; they having suffered during the persecution more than other Churches, were in greater need of assistance.

Constantine proceeded to show in several ways a favourable disposition towards Christianity. He appointed the celebrated Christian teacher Lactantius tutor to his son Crispus. He founded the Lateran Basilica at Rome within the walls of the palace-residence of his wife Fausta, signifying thereby his desire that his wife and family should attend the services of the Chris-

tian Church. He bestowed many favours on the Church, which the old religion had previously enjoyed. In 315 he exempted the lands of the clergy from ordinary taxation, and abolished several regulations offensive to the Christians. In 316 he allowed the manumission of slaves to be effected, not as before in the heathen temples, but in the Christian churches, without the intervention of a magistrate. In 319 he made the first direct aggression on the Pagans, by discountenancing their sacrifices, and forbidding them to be made in private houses. In 321 he exempted the clergy from municipal duties, on the ground that they ought not to be withdrawn from their spiritual work. In the same year he issued an edict for the general observance of Sunday, not, however, as the Lord's Day, but as the Festival of heathen worship, the Day of the Sun (*dies Solis*); on that day all labour, except agriculture, was forbidden. By another edict of that year the Church was allowed to receive legacies, a right of which it had been deprived by Diocletian.

But the final victory of Christianity was not yet gained. It can scarcely be wondered that, though Constantine allowed the same privileges to heathenism that he did to Christianity, and though he continued himself to observe the old national rites, he excited the jealousy and animosity of the heathen. So they determined to make one more stand, and they found a willing leader in Licinius. Licinius, although he had given a half-hearted support to Constantine in the edicts of toleration, still in his heart opposed Christianity and oppressed the Christians in his dominions; he was also envious of the success, and jealous of the popularity, of Constantine, and it was said that he had determined to issue another edict for another general persecution. This, however, was not to be; the battle of Adrianople fought between him and Constantine, A.D. 323, after gaining which Constantine ordered him to be put to death, left one sole and undisputed ruler of the Roman Empire. The battle was a religious one between the opposing forces of Christianity and

Paganism, and the consequence was the establishment by Constantine of Christianity as the Religion of the Roman Empire. The edicts issued by Licinius against the Christians were repealed; the right of receiving legacies, which was at first restricted to the West, was now extended to the East; and Constantine issued an exhortation to his subjects to abandon the heathen superstition, and to worship one God, the Saviour Jesus Christ.

The cessation of persecution, and the toleration accorded them by the Emperor, was a great gain to the Christians; but all the time Constantine himself was not a Christian. This is the more remarkable when viewed in relation to the phenomenon which Constantine evidently believed was miraculously vouchsafed to him. The story of the vision of the Cross, his biographer Eusebius asserts, was communicated to him by Constantine himself, who confirmed it with an oath. It was not till the Emperor was an old man, and had abundant time for reflexion, that he revealed the story. So that it cannot be doubted that Constantine believed what he stated; that he dreamed it, as Sozomen thinks, or that his excited imagination converted a natural phenomenon into a miraculous interposition, is likely enough. Still Constantine believed it.

The story is this. On his march from Gaul (A.D. 312) to his victory at the Milvian Bridge, Constantine, whose mind was wavering between Christianity and Paganism, aware that his enemy was seeking the aid of magic and supernatural rites for the contest; remembering also that his father had always prospered, whilst their persecutors failed, determined to pray to the God of the Christians. Whilst he was engaged in such thoughts, he saw, during the clear mid-day, a luminous Cross in the Heavens, with the words, "By this conquer" (ἐν τούτῳ νίκα). Both he and the whole army were struck with awe at the apparition; and when he fell asleep, still wondering as to its meaning, Christ Himself appeared to him, holding in His hand the

same symbol, which He ordered him to have inscribed upon his standard, assuring him at the same time of victory. On the next day Constantine ordered the Cross, with the monogram of the first letters of the Saviour's name, to be inscribed on the Imperial standard, which thenceforward took the name of *Labarum*.

Still Constantine, however much impressed with the vision, and much as he admired Christianity, continued to put off the Sacrament which would admit him into the Church.

No sooner had the age of persecution ceased, than a still severer and more permanent danger from within assailed the Church. Peace was the desire of Constantine's heart, but that peace which he had brought to the State he did not find in the Church ; so, with the best intentions, but the most unfortunate results, he, whilst still unbaptized, assumed an autocratic despotism in the government of the Christian Church.

The Donatist schism arose out of the Diocletian persecution, and had its origin in the action of the Church towards the *Traditors*. On the death (A.D. 311) of Mensurius, Bishop of Carthage, Cæcilian, his Archdeacon, was canonically elected his successor, and was consecrated by Felix, Bishop of Aptunga. Mensurius was accused of indirectly countenancing the Traditors by a subtle distinction of giving up heretical writings, in the place of the genuine Scriptures. The Bishops of Numidia, which was under the jurisdiction of Carthage, complained that the election of Cæcilian had been made in their absence, that he ought to have been consecrated by the Primate of Numidia, and that Felix himself had been a Traditor. They therefore, headed by Donatus, Bishop of Casæ Nigræ, excommunicated Cæcilian and appointed Majorinus in his place.

Seventy African Bishops concurred in the deposition of Cæcilian, but everywhere else, except in Africa, he was recognised as the canonical Bishop of Carthage. Constantine also adopted his cause, and in the relief which he sent to the African Bishops, insisted that it should be confined to those who were

in communion with him, and ordered proceedings to be taken against this schismatical party, whose "madness was seducing the *Catholic* people."

The Donatists (to call them by the name which they soon afterwards adopted) requested Constantine to order their cause to be tried by the Bishops of Gaul, whose country had not been visited by the persecution, and who therefore might be presumed to be impartial in the question of the Traditors. He in compliance with their request, issued a commission to the Bishops of Cologne, Autun, and Arles, with whom he associated Melchiades, Bishop of Rome (311—314), to enquire into the case. A council under Melchiades, attended by some twenty Bishops, tried the case in the Lateran Palace at Rome, Donatus and ten African Bishops representing his party. Judgment was given in favour of Cæcilian; the case of Felix was not gone into, but a civil commission decided his innocence, and that the charge of his having been a Traditor was a forgery.

The Donatists still discontented, and regarding the decision of the African Bishops more weighty than that pronounced by the Gallican Bishops, requested Constantine to summon a council of all the Western Bishops. A second Council, therefore, in obedience to the command of Constantine, assembled on August 1, A.D. 314, at Arles, under the presidency of Marinus, Bishop of the Diocese. About four hundred Bishops attended, amongst whom were three from Britain, Eborius of York, Restitutus of London, and Adelfius, probably Bishop of Caerleon-on-Usk (wrongly described as "de civitate Coloniae Londinensium"). Cæcilian was again victorious; but on the death of Majorinus, A.D. 315, the Donatists elected another schismatical Bishop, a second Donatus, more eminent than the first, from whom they took their name.

• At the Council of Arles twenty-two canons were passed. The first decreed that all Christians should keep Easter on the same day. The Donatists were in the habit of re-iterating Baptism;

against this custom the eighth canon enacted that in the case of people converted from heresy who had been baptized in the name of the Trinity, Baptism was not to be repeated.

The Donatists, however, being still discontented, Constantine, who at first thought of punishing them with death, contented himself with expelling them from their churches and banishing them.

They however still continued to trouble the Church. The sect, originating with the question as to Cæcilian's consecration, and not at first differing from the Church on points of doctrine, was led on to many extravagancies. They maintained that they were the whole Church, that all other Christians were schismatical, and their sacraments inefficacious. In opposition to the Council of Arles they continued to re-baptize their converts, and to re-ordain the clergy that went over to them; whilst even Bishops, before they were admitted to their Communion, were subjected to a public penance. If they gained possession of Catholic churches, they purified them as unconsecrated places, burning the altars and consecrated plate, and casting out the Eucharist to the dogs.

One fanatical sect amongst them, called *Circumcelliones* (*circum cella*), from their going round the *Cells* and cottages of the poor, were a set of sturdy beggars, who under the pretence of religion preferred to gain a livelihood by plunder rather than labour. They were mere highway robbers, attacking and plundering whomsoever they met; forcing their way into the cottages, begging and seizing whatsoever they laid hands on, and committing acts of violence and lust. Frequently by dint of numbers they gained possession of the churches, when they cruelly maltreated the Catholic clergy. At the same time they courted death, flattering themselves that they would thus be accounted martyrs and win heaven.

The Donatist schism, although it raged with all the fury incidental to ecclesiastical warfare, and although it lasted for

many years afterwards, was at first one of discipline and of a local character. A more important heresy, inasmuch as it permeated the whole Church, and has since lasted throughout all time, was with regard to the Trinity.

Heretical opinions with regard to the Godhead which originated in the time of the Apostles, lived on under the different forms of the Gnostic heresy, in the Second Century. At the commencement of the Third Century, about A.D. 200, Praxeas, a native of Asia Minor, who had once been a Montanist, but afterwards became a powerful opponent of that sect (incurring thereby the wrath of Tertullian), taught in Rome with considerable success heretical opinions on the Trinity. Whilst upholding the Unity of the Godhead, he discarded the distinction of Persons, and taught that the same Person Created, Redeemed, and Sanctified mankind. Hence his disciples were called Monarchians (a Greek word signifying the same as the Latin *Unitarians*), and Patripassians, the latter name embodying the logical result of his teaching, that the Father Himself suffered.

A similar heresy was taught by Noetus, a native of Smyrna, who flourished about A.D. 235. He reasoned that, since the Bible declares that there is only one God, and since Christ is God and suffered on the Cross, it follows that the Father also was begotten and suffered and died.

But a greater and more important man than these was Sabellius, who, probably an Italian by birth, but meeting with much opposition at Rome, went to the East, and was ordained a Presbyter at Ptolemais. About A.D. 257, or perhaps earlier, he taught that as man is constituted of body, soul, and spirit, so the Persons in the Trinity are three denominations under one hypostasis; and that there was really only One Person spoken of under three titles. The Deity delivered the Law in the Old Testament, as God the Father; in the New Testament He was Incarnate as the Son; and descended on the Day of Pentecost as the Holy Ghost. Sabellius, however, denied that he was a Patripassian.

An outbreak of the Sabellian heresy having occurred in the Diocese of Alexandria, the matter was brought before its Bishop, Dionysius, who had been one of Origen's most distinguished pupils, and succeeded Heraclas, first in the headship of the Catechetical School, and afterwards in the See of Alexandria. Dionysius, whilst examining the matter, laid himself open to what was afterwards known as Arianism, and his words were reported to the Bishop of Rome, whose name was also Dionysius (259—269). The latter, after holding a Council, demanded from him an explanation, which the Bishop of Alexandria, although not subject to Rome, willingly accorded, and was pronounced innocent of the charge.

About the same time, another form of the same heresy is accredited to Paul, a native of Samosata and Bishop of Antioch, who perhaps enjoys the unenviable notoriety of being the first Episcopal Heresiarch. Of this ecclesiastical mountebank a short account must be given, for he is an instance among many how religious extravagances are often traceable to eccentricities of character.

Having through the interest of Zenobia, Queen of Palmyra, obtained the lucrative post of Ducenarius (*δοικηνάριος*, so called, says Gibbon, from the salary of two hundred sesterces, equivalent to about £1,600, which was attached to it), he preferred to be called by that title rather than that of Bishop, affecting all the pomp of a Roman magistrate; appearing in places of public resort with a large retinue of attendants, and introducing a theatrical affectation into the Church. He caused a high and conspicuous episcopal throne to be erected in his cathedral, used violent gestures in preaching, expecting his audience to express their admiration by clapping of hands, as in a theatre, and substituted hymns in praise of himself for those of Christ. His moral character also was far from blameless.

These matters caused scandal enough, but they were brought to a head by his heretical teaching on the Incarnation and the

Trinity. He taught that there were not Three Persons in the Godhead, but literally one God. The Logos or Word was not a distinct Person ; but the Logos and the Holy Spirit were in the Father in the same manner as Reason and Spirit were in man, without any distinctive personal existence. Jesus Christ was not by nature exalted above other men, and is only called God because the Logos descended on Him, and in Him, without there being any personal union, inhabited.

He was opposed by Dionysius, Bishop of Rome, and Dionysius of Alexandria, and having been condemned in two Councils held in Antioch, one A.D. 264, the other A.D. 269, he was deposed, and Domnus elected Bishop in his place.

It is impossible in a work like this to describe the heresy of the Manichæans, which can scarcely be considered a Christian heresy, but which advanced the Gnostic principles of two Gods, and was taught about A.D. 277 by a Persian named Manes or Mani, with the professed view of reconciling Christianity with Persian philosophy.

An important schism, which lasted for one hundred and fifty years, had its origin at the commencement of the Fourth Century. Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis in the Thebaid, had been deposed, after a Council, by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria (300—312). Peter, a man of eminently holy and gentle character, who had himself been a Confessor, had, yielding to the intercession of the Martyrs and Confessors, received back into communion many who through fear of torture had fallen away during the Diocletian persecution. Meletius, who had himself also suffered in the persecution, actuated with no friendly feeling to Peter, accused him of too great leniency, and drew over many Bishops to his side. After the death of their founder the Meletians continued to ordain their own Bishops, and to trouble Egypt with their factions and schisms. They gained a reputation for a great severity of life, and joined the adversaries of St. Athanasius, of whom we shall hear more presently, in persecuting him, and

Athanasius says of them that, as Pontius Pilate and Herod forgot their enmity to persecute Christ, so the Meletians agreed with their enemies in opposition to His followers.

We now come to the Arian heresy, which, sad in its inception, and equally sad in the consequences which followed it, had one satisfactory result, viz., that it led to the assembling of General Councils of the whole Church, and the drawing up a systematic Creed for the Christian world. The Arian controversy marks an important era; the persecutions from the heathen had ceased to be formidable, and the Church was now ostensibly supported by the powers of the world. But the Church was divided into two great parties, and thenceforward its differences form the central point not only in ecclesiastical history, but also in the political history of the Roman Empire.

Arius (256—336), born in Libya, a man of unblemished moral character, of dignified appearance, and fascinating eloquence, as well as of considerable learning, was ordained Deacon by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, but was afterwards excommunicated by him on account of his adherence to the Meletians; and so badly did Peter think of him, that, even to his death, he persisted in refusing to withdraw the sentence. After the death of Peter, which resulted from the tortures inflicted on him in the late persecution, Achillas, his successor in the See, readmitted Arius to communion and ordained him a Priest. Achillas was succeeded by Alexander (313—326), Arius being, it was supposed, disappointed at not being himself elected.

In a circular letter (A.D. 313), addressed to his Bishops, Alexander dwelt on the co-essential and co-equal Majesty of the Father and the Son. Arius objected that the doctrine savoured of Sabellianism, and confusion of the Persons of the Trinity. But he himself went to the opposite extreme, and insisted that there was a time when the Father existed alone; that as the Son was begotten by the Father, there must have been a time

when the Son *was not* (ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ Χριστός), and that He is inferior to the Father in substance and eternity. Arius had on his side two influential Bishops, Eusebius of Nicomedia, who had been his fellow-pupil in the school of Antioch, and in a lesser degree, Eusebius of Cæsarea, the historian. Alexander, his Bishop, called on Arius to retract his opinions, and on his refusal, excommunicated him in a Council held at Antioch, A.D. 321. Arius then went first to Palestine, and afterwards to Nicomedia, where he was kindly welcomed by Eusebius the Bishop, shortly afterwards returning to Alexandria.

Constantine, whose mind was little adapted to such minute theological questions, wrote, through Hosius Bishop of Cordova in Spain, who was at that time his friend and confidential adviser, to the two disputants, exhorting them to unity and peace on what he considered trivial differences. Hosius held another Council at Alexandria A.D. 325, but Arius, although he was again condemned, still remained obdurate. Constantine, who had hitherto been the protector, now determined to assert his rights as Head, of the Church, and finding that provincial synods had failed to convince Arius, determined to convene a General Council of the whole Church, not only for settling the Arian controversy, but also for determining the right time of keeping Easter, and for ending the Meletian schism; and Nice was selected as a convenient place, being near to his own Palace of Nicomedia.

The great Council of Nice met on June 19, A.D. 325, at first in the Cathedral, but on the arrival of the Emperor on July 3, it was transferred to the Imperial Palace. Constantine, magnificently attired, declined (Eusebius tells us) to take his seat on the golden throne prepared for him, till invited to do so by the assembled Bishops. About three hundred and eighteen Bishops, with many of the lower orders of Clergy, attended. Sylvester, Bishop of Rome (314—335), who was too old to take so long a journey, was represented by two Priests. Alexander, Bishop of Alex-

andria, attended by his Deacon, Athanasius, was present ; (this is the first mention we have in the Church's history of this illustrious champion of the Faith). Hosius probably presided at the Council. Amongst the Bishops were Theophilus, " Bishop of the Goths ;" Acesius, Bishop of the Novatian sect, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and his name-sake of Cæsarea. The list of those who attended is incomplete and untrustworthy, so that it cannot be said for certain whether Bishops from Britain attended, although it is probable they did ; for Eusebius says that Constantine summoned Bishops *from all the provinces* (ἀπανταχόθεν) and provided them with carriages and other accommodation for the journey.

Constantine himself attended, delivering a speech in Latin exhorting to Unity, and himself frequently taking part in the debates. Arius being examined declared his belief that the Son was a created Being, Who at one time did not exist, and that He was also capable of sinning against God. The Eusebians, as the party of Eusebius of Nicomedia were called, defended Arius. On the other side Athanasius, who is described as short of stature, but with " the face of an Angel," took the prominent part, and thenceforward became the recognised head of the orthodox party. The Council sat for rather more than two months. The word *Homoousion* (of One Substance), which had been used in the preceding Council of Alexandria, was adopted as the key-note of orthodoxy, and a Creed drawn up by Eusebius of Cæsarea was refused because it did not contain the word. Hosius then, being commissioned by the Council, drew up a Creed, the nucleus of the Nicene Creed, which was approved by the Council, in the following words :—

" We believe in One God (πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεόν) the Father Almighty, Maker of all things, both visible and invisible. And in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Begotten of the Father, that is, of the Substance of the Father (ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς). God of God. Light of Light. Very God of Very

God. Begotten, not made. Of one Substance with the Father. By Whom all things were made, that are in Heaven and in earth. Who for us men and our salvation came down, and was Incarnate, and was made Man. He suffered and rose again the third day, and ascended into Heaven. And He shall come again to judge the quick and the dead.

“And in the Holy Ghost.”

“And as to those who affirm that there was a time when the Son of God was not (*ὅτι ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*); and that before He was begotten, He was not (*πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν*); and that He was made out of nothing (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων γεννηθῆναι*); or that He is of a different Substance or Essence (*ἐξ ἐτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι*); or that He is created, or subject to change or alteration (*ἢ κτιστὸν, ἢ τρεπτὸν, ἢ ἀλλοίωτον*); they are anathematized by the Holy Catholic Church.”

Seventeen Arian Bishops at first refused, but ultimately all except three, through pressure from the Emperor, consented to sign the Creed. Eusebius of Cæsarea subscribed with an explanation, which he afterwards sent to his Diocese, of the sense in which he admitted the Homoousion. Arius was banished to Illyria by command of the Emperor, who afterwards ordered Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, and Theognis of Nice, into exile.

Meletius, the schismatical Bishop of Lycopolis, was deposed, and his ordinations pronounced invalid.

With regard to the time of observing Easter, the Council decided that it should be kept on the next Sunday after the first full moon following March 21, the Bishop of Alexandria in the East being deputed to ascertain the right day in each year, and to communicate it to the Bishop of Rome in the West.

At the time of the Nicene Council, no controversy with regard to the Holy Ghost was brought into prominence; the Creed therefore concluded with the words, “And in the Holy Ghost.”

The Second Canon of the Council gave the second place of dignity amongst the Bishoprics to the See of Jerusalem; “Saving

to the Metropolis its proper dignity, let the Bishop of Ælia have the next place of precedence."

The Church Historian Socrates mentions the following anecdote as having been communicated by a Novatian who attended the Council. The Emperor asked the Novatian Bishop Acecius, whether he was satisfied with the decrees of the Council, and as to the observance of Easter. He replied that he was satisfied with both, as being conformable to Apostolical authority, but that he must deny the power of the Church to grant absolution (whatever might be hoped from God's mercy) to those who fell into mortal sin after Baptism. "Then," said Constantine, "you had better set up a ladder for yourself, and climb up to Heaven alone."

In 326, Constantine's Mother Helena, at the age of eighty years, and fifteen years after her conversion, went to Palestine to visit the scenes hallowed by the Redeemer. Eusebius states that it was through Constantine's influence that she embraced Christianity; other writers affirm that she was the means of instilling into him whatever ideas he at that time possessed favourable to Christianity. Constantine wrote a letter to Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem, concerning the erection of a magnificent church on Mount Calvary; and with the view of seeing the work executed, and also of discovering the Holy Cross, Helena is said to have undertaken the journey. She ordered the Temple of Venus, which Hadrian had erected over the Saviour's Sepulchre, to be demolished, and the stones and rubbish which the heathen had heaped up, to be cleared away. Eusebius, however, says that the excavation had been previously made by order of Constantine. However this may have been, the Holy Sepulchre with, it is alleged, the three Crosses, were brought to light, the true Cross being, according to SS. Chrysostom and Ambrose, distinguished by the inscription; or, by other accounts, by Its miraculous form. To finish the legend; part of the Holy Cross was enshrined in a silver case at Jerusalem, part was sent to Constantinople and was used by Constantine for his crown,

and (by no means a reverential use) for the bit of his horse. From the Pontificate of St. Gregory the Great, the Festival of the Invention or Discovery of the Holy Cross has been observed and is commemorated in the Calendar on May 3.

Constantine, if he had many virtues, had also in his character many serious vices. In 326, to the amazement and horror of the Roman world, he was instrumental in causing the death of his son Crispus, the only child of his first wife, a youth of brilliant promise, and presumptive heir to the Empire, but unfortunately enjoying a dangerous popularity. By the high qualities which he displayed as a statesman and a warrior, he excited the jealousy of the Emperor, who feared in him a formidable opponent, and who lent his ear to the slanders of his step-mother Fausta. Whilst Rome was celebrating with great splendour the twentieth anniversary of Constantine's accession, to attend which Constantine had travelled from Nicomedia to Rome, Crispus was apprehended and sent in banishment to Istria, and soon afterwards put to death. The young Cæsar Licinius, son of the late Emperor, and Constantine's nephew, shared his fate. Some attribute the fate of Crispus to the ambition of Fausta, who desired the succession of her own sons to the Empire. However this may be, Fausta herself, the mother of three sons who survived Constantine, herself fell a victim to his jealous suspicion, and was found strangled in her bath.

Meanwhile Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, having died, A.D. 326, Athanasius, who was about thirty years of age, was by the universal choice of the orthodox elected to succeed him in the See, which he most reluctantly accepted, and held for forty-six years. Born at Alexandria of Christian parents, and educated under the careful eye of the future Bishop Alexander, he acquired a profound knowledge of the Scriptures, of the Fathers, and of the Canons of the Church; and after spending some time, as a means of preparation, with the noted hermit, St. Antony, he was ordained by Alexander, who appointed him his Deacon.

The ability which he displayed at Nice in counteracting their heresy, laid the foundation of the bitter hatred with which the Arians ever afterwards pursued him. His whole life was an illustration of the apothegm, *Athanasius contra mundum* (Athanasius against the world), and it is probable that but for him, Arianism would have been the form of Christianity in the Eastern Church.

The Nicene Faith was generally received in the West, but in the Churches of the East a strong opposition was kept up by the Eusebians. The Arian troubles soon broke out afresh.

His sister Constantia, who had been brought under the influence of Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, exercised a powerful control over the Emperor, and on her death-bed (A.D. 327) succeeded in convincing him that Arius had been unjustly condemned, and in obtaining a promise that he should be recalled from exile. The year after her death, Arius, and soon afterwards Eusebius and Theognis were recalled. Constantine ordered Athanasius to receive Arius to communion.

The attitude of the Emperor towards Athanasius now underwent a complete change. There is no reason for supposing that Constantine ever had any settled conviction in favour of the Arian doctrine. He simply could not understand the importance of the distinction between Arianism and orthodoxy, and he considered the disputes between the two parties unimportant and frivolous. Hosius had hitherto been his adviser, but he now exchanged him for Eusebius, the Bishop of the Diocese of Nicomedia, within which his own palace was situated, and he was therefore brought into frequent contact with him. Eusebius, a clever and crafty man, maintained to the Emperor that he himself held the doctrines of Nice; and Constantine was led by his artifices to harbour suspicions against Athanasius, not so much on the ground of his faith as on other grounds, so as to lend his ear to accusations which were maliciously brought against him by his Arian enemies.

On May 11, A.D. 330, took place the dedication of Constantine's new city on the Bosphorus, erected on the ruins of the ancient Byzantium, to which an edict engraved on a marble slab ascribed the title of New Rome. He said he had chosen the spot in obedience to the command of God (*jubente Deo*). He had noticed in his late war with Licinius the incomparable position of the city; and no doubt fixed upon it as an advantageous point of observation on two nations destined soon to commit such fearful havoc on the Roman Empire; the German tribes on the Danube, who were keeping a watchful eye on the increasing decrepitude of Rome, and the Persians in Asia, who were yearning for the opportunity for shaking off the yoke of an ignominious treaty. Probably for a similar reason Diocletian had transferred the seat of government from Rome to Nicomedia, but the memory of Diocletian and its associations with the late persecution would have rendered it odious to the protector of the Christians.

No expense was spared by Constantine to render the New Rome a successful rival in magnificence to the old seat of government. Works of art to adorn it were brought together from all parts of the world; the cities of Greece and Asia were ransacked and despoiled of their most valuable treasures, of the trophies of war, of the noblest works of art, and their objects of religious veneration. Unlike Old Rome, the New Rome was to be a Christian city from its foundation; existing heathen temples were allowed to continue, and Constantine even imported statues of the gods for its adornment; but the new churches to be built were to be Christian. It was a full recognition of Christianity as the religion of the Roman Empire.

Filled with remorse for the cruel murder of his son, whose innocence he had discovered when it was too late, to whose memory in his bitter repentance he did the little he could by raising a golden statue, inscribed "To my unfortunate son;" hating the scenes of his former glory; and smarting under the thinly-disguised insults of the Roman populace, who not only

resented the abandonment of the old religion, but also his recent barbarities, and especially the murder of Crispus, Constantine determined to keep aloof from Old Rome, and transferred the seat of government to his new foundation, which he called after his own name, Constantinople.

The foundation of Constantinople and the transference thither of the seat of government were acts of the greatest importance to the Church. The Emperor had hitherto been the great person at Rome; thenceforward the Bishop of Rome took his place. The honour which had always attached to Rome still continued, and enhanced the prestige of Rome's Bishop. Another wedge was thus inserted of the Roman Bishops' supremacy, of their claims, as being Bishops of the first city in the world, to be Bishops of the whole world. Everything went to favour them. Rome being freed from the presence of the Emperor, grew independent of secular control. The Bishops of Constantinople, on the other hand, being under the very eye of the Emperor, were cramped and harassed, and their influence weakened by the interference of the Emperors; whilst at the same time the Emperors found it to their advantage to court the Patriarch of the West (for we soon find the title of Patriarch accorded to the Bishops of the highest Sees), and to use him as a check on their own Patriarch.

But an ecclesiastical ascendancy was accorded to New Rome in the East, on the same ground as it was accorded to Old Rome in the West, viz., that it was the seat of the Imperial Government. The Councils of the Church decreed that as a supremacy belonged to Rome, as the former seat of government, so an equal supremacy attached to Constantinople as being the new seat of Government.

The ascendancy of Constantinople excited the jealousy not only of Rome, but also of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, who in their frequent differences eagerly sought the friendship of the sole Patriarch of the West. Their suffragan

Bishops also, if disappointed in the treatment which they met with from their own Patriarchs, following their example, likewise threw themselves upon the Patriarch of Rome. Thus the superstructure of Rome's supremacy laid by the Clementine forgery was built up; and what was at first given by Rome as advice, afterwards assumed the character of command. But serious quarrels between Old Rome and New Rome were the consequence, and ended in an unhappy schism.

Soon after Arius returned from exile, the Eusebian party set themselves to undo the work of Nice and to propagate Arianism. They first attacked Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch, a man of blameless life, but whom they accused of various crimes, and in 330 he was deposed by an Arian Synod, and ordered by Constantine into banishment, Euphronius, an Arian, being appointed to his See.

But their vengeance was especially directed against Athanasius, whom they assailed with a series of charges. One only need be adduced as a specimen of all. He was accused of murdering a Meletian Bishop named Arsenius, and of keeping his hand, which his enemies undertook to produce, for magical purposes. Constantine ordered him to appear before a Council at Cæsarea to answer to the charge; but Athanasius, feeling that the Bishop of that See was prejudiced against him, refused to attend; whereupon he was ordered before a Council at Tyre, under threat from Constantine in case of his refusal. The Council, consisting chiefly of Arian Bishops, met in August, A.D. 335; Athanasius attended, accompanied by forty-nine Egyptian Bishops. Eusebius of Cæsarea was appointed judge, and the pretended hand of Arsenius was produced in a wooden box. A man muffled in a cloak from head to foot was then brought in alive and well, who proved to be Arsenius himself, whom the Arians had thought secure in safe concealment, and with both his hands un mutilated. Socrates and Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, the continuators of the history of Eusebius

(which ends at the beginning of Constantine's reign), both relate the story.

Another charge, one of immorality with a consecrated Virgin, which was brought against him, need not be entered into; it was, like the other, an unfounded imposture.

Notwithstanding that his innocence had been proved before the Council, the Arians charged him with being a magician; and such was the feeling against him, that the civil authorities were compelled to rescue him out of their hands, and to hurry him on board a ship which sailed that night for Constantinople. Thereupon the Council pronounced against him a sentence of deposition, the supposed murdered man Arsenius signing his condemnation.

At Constantinople he succeeded, after several refusals, in obtaining an audience of the Emperor, who called upon the Bishops to come to Constantinople and justify their sentence. But meanwhile the Bishops had gone to Jerusalem for the dedication, in September, 335, of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which Constantine had himself built. Only six of the number obeyed the summons; amongst them were his chief opponents, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis, Ursacius, and Valens. Dropping the former accusations, they now brought against him another, equally unfounded, of hindering the transportation of corn from Alexandria, the great granary of the East, to Constantinople. The Emperor, who was now entirely in the hands of Eusebius, believed the charge, and Athanasius was banished to Treves. Here he was received with the highest honour by Maximin the Bishop, and made the acquaintance, which was afterwards of great consequence, of the future Emperor Constantine II., who was at the time residing there in the Imperial Palace.

The Alexandrians, taking the part of their Bishop, refused to receive Arius into communion. He thereupon went to Constantinople, and the Emperor wrote to the Patriarch Alexander,

ordering him to hold communion with him, the Eusebians threatening him with excommunication in case of his refusal. The Patriarch, a man more than ninety years of age, objected that he could not receive the Heresiarch. It was Saturday, the day before Arius intended to present himself, and on that day, his death being probably accelerated by the excitement of his troublous life, he suddenly died. In the same year (A.D. 336) Alexander the Bishop also died, and in the next year Constantine followed them to the grave.

Notwithstanding the strong interest which he took in the Church, Constantine remained till the last year of his life in his unbaptized state. Many reasons have been suggested for the postponement of his Baptism. He himself stated that he deferred it till he could be baptized in the waters of Jordan. Perhaps the delay was also attributable to a high estimate of the sacredness of the Sacrament, and of post-baptismal responsibility. Constantine was a man of peace at almost any price, and he may also have thought that through so decided a step he would forfeit the allegiance of the heathen. Or again, he may have persisted to the last in wavering between the two religions, and have been unwilling to commit himself thoroughly to Christianity by so irretrievable a measure. However this may be, being seized with a fatal illness in his Palace at Nicomedia, and warned that his end was near, he at last received Baptism from Eusebius, the Arian Bishop of the Diocese, and whilst still wearing his baptismal robes, died, in his sixty-fourth year, on Whitsunday, A.D. 337.

If we take a review of his whole life, it would appear that his choice of a religion was greatly influenced by political and personal considerations. When once, however, he finally resolved to embrace Christianity, there is no reason to doubt the sincerity, according to his lights, of his convictions. His ideas on Church doctrine and discipline were vague and indefinite; but the various motives by which he was swayed all seemed to

him to converge in Christianity. He hated persecution, and the Christians had been persecuted. All the Emperors who had oppressed the Church in the late persecution had come to violent and ignominious ends; remorse of conscience and mental derangement had clouded the last days of the best of them, Diocletian. His own father Constantius, the only Emperor who had favoured the Christians, was also the only one who had descended to a peaceful and honourable grave.

The strongest proof of his convictions is to be found in his munificent bounty to the Church. He ordered numerous churches to be built in various places sufficient to accommodate the whole Christian population. Many churches in Rome claim Constantine as their founder. Mention has already been made of the Lateran Basilica. On the Vatican, in the place of a Temple to Apollo, he founded a church on the site now occupied by St. Peter's, a place hallowed in the eyes of Christians as the supposed site of St. Peter's martyrdom. Another church he dedicated to St. Paul; two others to SS. Laurence and Agnes, the former a martyr in the Valerian, the latter in the Diocletian Persecution. Churches were built by him in Palestine at Bethlehem, the scene of the Saviour's birth, at Calvary of His death, on the Mount of Olives of His Ascension.

At Jerusalem, near the spot where the Holy Sepulchre was said to be brought to light, he built the church which at first took the name of the Church of the Resurrection, but was afterwards called the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. At Mamre he built a church where the Angels appeared to Abraham. Another splendid church he built at Antioch, famous afterwards for the synod of Bishops which was held there to celebrate its Dedication.

Churches were built in every quarter of New Rome. There he laid the foundation of the church to be dedicated to the Wisdom of God, Sancta Sophia, which, having been destroyed by fire, was rebuilt by the Emperor Justinian, and remains to the present day, for nearly four and a half centuries, alas! a Mahomedan Mosque.

The reign of Constantine effected in theory no change in the relations which had before existed in the Roman Empire between the civil and religious governments; it simply perpetuated them, Christianity being substituted for Paganism as the Religion of the State. The Roman Emperor always had been Head of the State in ecclesiastical as well as in civil matters, when Paganism was the national religion, and Constantine continued to bear the title of Pontifex Maximus under Christianity. But, practically, the Christian Church lost its independence; it became (to adopt the usual phrase) an established religion; it put itself under a predominant partner, without whose sanction it could not call together General Councils for defining matters of faith and for the enactment of Canons, nor appoint its supreme rulers; a partner who, instead of confining himself (as Constantine had intended) to external order, soon encroached on the internal life of the Church.

Constantine is regarded as the Founder of so-called Established Religions. It would be beside our purpose to trench upon the region of politics, and to make more than a passing remark on the vexed question of the union between Church and State. But a few words on the subject may not be out of season.

The Empire was supposed to gain more than it did by having the Church as its ally; the Church to gain more than it did by having the countenance of the Civil Law in the protection of its rights and property. But both Church and State suffered from the want of definite limitations to regulate their respective rights. It wanted no great ingenuity to forecast that after Constantine was dead and gone, difficulties would arise, and the weaker party for the time being (and the weaker party at first was the Roman Empire) would go to the wall. He could have little thought that the time was at no great distance when the Spiritual Head of the Church on earth would assume the right to make and depose Emperors; or keep a King of Germany standing, for three days and nights, barefooted in the piercing cold of a winter amongst the Apennines, before being ad-

mitted into his presence ; or could compel the strongest amongst the Emperors to hold his stirrup whilst he mounted his horse.

And in the interest of the Church, the alliance might possibly work tolerably well, so long as there was one National Religion ; but how would it work if Religion became broken up into several conflicting sects ?

In order to support the religious requirements of the Christian world, it was necessary that the Church should possess property and endowments. So in early days the practice, derived from Scripture, prevailed, of Christians devoting the tenth of their property to their faith. As amongst the Jews the tithe belonged to the tribe of Levi, so under the Christian dispensation it was paid to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons of the Catholic Church.

In time pious Founders, Kings, Nobles, and rich landowners, bequeathed a portion of their property to support the faith of their Church ; and, at a time when heresy and dissent from it was counted a deadly sin (*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*), to counteract such opponents.

This property was generally expended for the good of the State as well as the Church. In the mediæval Church, the excessive and improperly spent wealth of Popes and Cardinals and Prelates was detrimental to the good of society, and called for the legitimate interference of the Civil powers. But at the period known as the Reformation, matters were put on a better footing, so that in the present day, at any rate in England, the endowments of the Catholics were never put to better use.

But in time various religions would, and did, rend asunder the seamless robe of Christ. Under the altered circumstances it would be, and is, contended by the Civil power, that the Catholic Church is unduly privileged ; that it is thus a grievance to some and therefore must undergo the crucible of Disendowment. Nay, it is even said that the *pious* Founders themselves, if sum-

moned from their graves, would be the first to approve the confiscation, and alienation of their property, from the purposes for which many of them lived and died.

The above short digression will perhaps be pardoned, as it is one brought into prominence by the reign of Constantine and his successors.

Constantine at his death left three sons who in the next year divided the Empire between them. His eldest son, Constantine II., who was twenty-one years of age, ruled over the West, retaining possession of Constantinople, with a certain superiority of rank. Constantius, aged twenty, ruled over the East, with Egypt, in which Alexandria, the Diocese of St. Athanasius, was situated; whilst Italy and Africa fell to the share of Constans, who was seventeen years of age. There were also two sons of Julius Constantius the brother of the late Emperor, the sole survivors of a general massacre made (it was supposed by instigation of the Emperor Constantius) on the family of Constantine, Gallus and Julian.

Constantine II., who is described as a pious Prince, restored (A.D. 338) Athanasius to his Diocese; but unhappily for the Church, he was killed in battle against his brother Constans (A.D. 340). Constans now became sole Emperor of the West, and was a favourer of St. Athanasius. But Constantius had been gained over to the side of the Arians. Eusebius the historian died A.D. 340, and Acacius his pupil succeeded him in the See of Cæsarea. Shortly afterwards Alexander, Bishop of Constantinople, died, and as the orthodox party predominated in the Diocese, Paul, a holy man and a determined opponent of the Arians, was appointed to succeed him. But his election was distasteful to Constantius; Paul was deposed, and Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, translated to the Metropolitan See.

In the early part of 341, a Synod at which Constantius was present, attended by ninety-seven Bishops mostly Arians, assembled at Antioch, whither they had gone for the Dedication of

the new Cathedral, which had been founded by Constantine I., and which from its magnificence was styled the Golden Church. The Synod drew up four Creeds, one of which was called the *Dedication Creed*, in which the most objectionable doctrines of Arianism were omitted, the Son was pronounced to be Begotten before the world; but the word Homooousion was studiously avoided. The Synod took high ground against Athanasius. Although his return to his Diocese had been sanctioned by Constantius, and ratified by a decree, made in the previous year, of a Synod at Tyre, it resolved that a Bishop, who had been canonically deposed, could only be restored by the same authority. At the same time they appointed in the place of Athanasius, one Pistus, an excommunicated Arian; but he was so universally condemned on the score of incompetence that he was unable to take possession of the Diocese. Thereupon Gregory of Cappadocia, who had been educated under Athanasius himself in the schools of Alexandria, was intruded by force of arms into the Patriarchal See.

In consequence of this fresh persecution, Athanasius fled to Rome, where he was kindly received by Pope Julius I. (337—352), with whom he resided eighteen months. The Pope of Alexandria (for the Bishops of that See were the *first* who were called by that title) laid his case before the Pope of Rome. Julius invited the Eusebians to a Council at Rome in December, A.D. 341, which however they declined to attend, and Athanasius was pronounced innocent of the charges which they had brought against them.

Eusebius, Bishop of Constantinople, died A.D. 342. The Athanasians revived the claims of Paul; the Arians supported Macedonius; Paul after much tumult and bloodshed was restored to the See. He was, however, again ejected, and Macedonius installed; and for nearly forty years (342—380), the Eastern capital was in the hands of the Arians.

In this troubled state of affairs, Constans, with the view of re-

conciling the Arians and Athanasians, prevailed with Constantius that a Council should be held at Sardica, the site of the modern Bulgaria, a place conveniently situated on the confines of both Empires. The Council accordingly met A.D. 347, attended by one hundred and seventy Eastern and Western Bishops, under the presidency of Hosius; seventy-six Arian Bishops also arrived. The Oriental Arians, however, refused to take part in the Council, if Athanasius and their opponents were allowed to attend it. They were informed that the Council was a general one, which was ready to hear both sides. The Arians, however, without waiting to hear its decisions, seceded to Philipopolis in Thrace, where they held a rival council, claiming to be the rightful representatives of Christendom; and renewed the former sentence against Athanasius.

The orthodox Council of Sardica denounced "the accursed Arian heresy," and acquitted Athanasius and his brethren (amongst whom doubtless Paul was included) as orthodox and lawful Bishops; and excommunicated Arius and eleven Arian Bishops. Two hundred and eighty-four Bishops, either then or afterwards, subscribed its decrees, which were ratified by a Council at Milan, A.D. 349.

Whether any British Bishops were present at the Council of Sardica is uncertain; but the British Church gave its adherence to its decrees; for St. Athanasius in his *Apology*, and afterwards in his *History of the Arians*, mentions the British Church as having supported his cause.

Amongst the twenty-one canons of the Council, one proposed by Hosius was of some significance. Any Bishop was allowed an appeal from a sentence of his own Metropolitan to Julius, Bishop of Rome, who might order a fresh trial by the Bishop of the neighbouring Province. The appeal was *personal* to Julius, who is expressly mentioned by name, doubtless on account of the friendship with which he had received Athanasius. Still a precedent was established, of which the Church of Rome quickly

availed itself; and thus was laid the foundation of Rome's appellate jurisdiction.

The Emperor Constans approved the decrees of Sardica, and invited Athanasius to visit him at Aquileia. The Arian Bishop Gregory died, or was murdered, A.D. 349. The Emperor Constantius, under threat of war from Constans, requested Athanasius to return to his Diocese. On his way thither he was kindly received by Constantius at Antioch, who called God to witness that he would erase all former charges, and receive no more accusations against him. He wrote to the Alexandrian laity to receive him back, speaking in flattering terms, which little accorded with his subsequent conduct, of their persecuted Bishop. Athanasius returned to Alexandria after an absence of eight years (341—349).

The victory of orthodoxy seemed now gained, and the Arians regarded their cause as lost. Two Bishops who had been Athanasius' most violent opponents, Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Syngidon, went to Rome, confessed that the charges against Athanasius were false, anathematized Arianism, and requested Julius and the clergy to admit them to communion.

Constantius also had allowed Paul to return to Constantinople; he was soon, however, again driven out and exiled to several places, and finally to Cucusus, a small unhealthy town on the confines of Cappadocia and Armenia. Here he died A.D. 351, as stated by the Arians, a natural death; but it was generally believed that, after being kept six days without food, he was strangled by Philip, the Prefect of the East, acting under orders from Constantius.

In 350 Maximin, Bishop of Jerusalem, died, and was succeeded by Cyril, generally known as Cyril of Jerusalem, who owed his election principally to the influence of Acacius, the Bishop of Cæsarea.

In 351 a Council at Sirmium deposed the Sabellian Bishop Photinus, who had taught that Jesus was a mere Man; that He

only pre-existed in the knowledge of God ; and that the Holy Ghost was merely an influence. At this Council the First Creed of Sirmium was drawn up, which St. Hilary, who about two years before had been appointed to the See of Poitiers and became the champion of Catholicity in Gaul, pronounced orthodox.

In 352 Julius, Bishop of Rome, died, and was succeeded by Liberius (352—366).

Meanwhile, on February 15, A.D. 350, a sad blow was inflicted on the Catholic cause by the death of Constans, who was killed in an insurrection under Magnentius, one of his Generals, who then assumed the government of the Western Empire ; he however in the following year suffered a defeat at the battle of Mursa, under the avenging hand of Constantius. Constantius spent the night preceding the battle in prayer with the Arian Bishop Valens, who foretold to him the victory as announced to him by an Angel from Heaven ; Valens regained the confidence of the Emperor, which, recanting his recantation, he determined to turn to his purposes against Athanasius. Magnentius having after his defeat in vain appealed to the clemency of the Emperor, died by his own hand, A.D. 353, and thus Constantius became sole Emperor, and the whole Roman Empire was subjected to the rule of an Arian.

It was now more than ever *Athanasius contra Mundum* ; the battle between the Church and Arianism was to be fought out, and it appeared that whichever party conquered would stamp its character on the religion of Christendom.

In 351 Constantius created his cousin Gallus, Cæsar, but, A.D. 354, caused him to be put to death. Julian was then the only one besides the Emperor, in the line of Constans, left, but being an object of suspicion to Constantius, he was involved in the disgrace of his brother, and was for a time imprisoned ; shortly afterwards, however, he was, at the entreaty of the Empress Eusebia, released, and, A.D. 355, having married the

—Emperor's sister Helena, was appointed to the command of the troops in Gaul, with the title of Cæsar.

No sooner was Constantius left in undisputed possession of the Empire than he forgot all his promises, and began such a persecution against Athanasius, that it was compared to those under Nero and Domitian. At a Council A.D. 353 at Arles, where Saturninus the Bishop was an Arian, and another, A.D. 355, at Milan, under its orthodox Bishop St. Dionysius, the assembled Bishops were intimidated by the presence of the Emperor; "What I will," he said, "let that be regarded as a Canon of the Church;" and he ordered them to condemn Athanasius. In vain, at the latter Synod, the orthodox Bishops demanded an examination of his doctrines; this was negatived through the opposition of Valens and Ursacius, and the sentence of condemnation against Athanasius was signed by nearly all the Bishops, both of the West and East. Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, and Dionysius of Milan, were deposed, and their Sees filled by Arians, Auxentius being appointed to that of Milan. To these were soon added many other Bishops (for the formulary of consent was sent to the absent Bishops), amongst them St. Hilary of Poitiers, Liberius of Rome, who was banished to Beræa, his See being filled by Felix, an antipope, and the aged Hosius, who was banished to Sirmium.

For a long time Liberius and Hosius in their banishment held out against all attempts of the Emperor to withdraw them from Athanasius, but under the hardships inflicted on them their courage at length failed them. After a year Hosius, labouring under the burden and weakness, both in body and mind, of a hundred years, and after having been cruelly beaten and stretched on the rack, succumbed, and signed an Arian Creed, the *Second Creed* of Sirmium, a Creed which Hilary declared "blasphemous;" and was then allowed to return to his Diocese. But he bitterly lamented his fall, and at his death, which occurred two years afterwards, anathematized the Arian heresy.

Liberius also, the Bishop of Rome, lending his ear to Demophilus, Bishop of Sirmium, who urged him not to sacrifice himself for one who had been condemned by so many Councils, subscribed the condemnation of Athanasius, whom he excommunicated, and accepted the *Catholic faith* of the Orientals expressed in the Second Creed of Sirmium. So the Bishop of Rome abandoned the Nicene Faith, and Hilary anathematized him. He was then allowed to return to Rome, and the antipope was expelled.

Meanwhile new plans had been set on foot for the ejection of Athanasius. Whilst, on February 9, A.D. 356, he with his Clergy and people were engaged in their midnight devotions in the church of St. Thomas at Alexandria, Syrianus, the Governour of Egypt, surrounded the church with five hundred soldiers, who broke down the doors and forced their way into the church, trampling under foot and killing many of the worshippers, treating the Bishops with insult, barbarously maltreating the consecrated virgins, and plundering the ornaments of the church, under the cloak of religious zeal. Athanasius, who, seated on his throne, calmly awaited what seemed to be certain death, at length, not before the last of the congregation had left the church, was hurried by the Clergy through a secret passage. The tumult and darkness favoured his escape; from that night he disappeared, and for six years (356—362) lived in unsuspected obscurity in the deserts of Egypt, from whence through his writings, which were widely circulated and eagerly read, he continued to instruct his flock. George of Cappadocia, an illiterate man, a stranger alike to humanity and morality, was intruded into his See, in which he showed himself the scourge of Christianity, and became the object of detestation not only with both parties of Christians, but the Pagans also.

The implacable hatred of Constantius in vain sought out Athanasius in all parts of the Roman Empire; rewards were offered for his apprehension, and penalties decreed against all

who should harbour him. Thinking that he had taken refuge in Ethiopia, he wrote to the Princes of that country not to give him an asylum; at the same time he requested them to send the Bishop Frumentius, whom Athanasius himself had consecrated, to establish the Church there, that he might receive instruction in the faith from the intruded Arian Bishop of Alexandria. Needless to say, Frumentius did not avail himself of the offer.

But now when Arianism seemed in its turn everywhere triumphant, it became torn asunder by divisions. There were the advanced Arians and Eusebians, who held the doctrine condemned at Nice; the followers of Arius and Eusebius of Constantinople. There were the Semi-Arians, who included most of the Eastern Bishops (the followers of Eusebius the historian), who held that the Son was of *like* Essence with the Father, whence they were called Homoiousians. This party Hilary of Poitiers did not consider heretical, and wrote requesting them to receive the Homoousion doctrine; "Bear with me, brethren," he said, "you are not Arians; why then join the Arians in denying the Homoousion?"

But now a third sect arose which carried out the doctrines of the extreme Arians more definitely to their logical conclusion. *Ætius*, an ignorant man, of low origin, after passing through many phases of life, had been ordained, but afterwards deposed, by *Leontius*, Bishop of Antioch. This man, as also his pupil *Eunomius* (who afterwards became Bishop of Cyzicus), taught that the Son was altogether and essentially unlike the Father; hence the party were called *Anomæans*, and sometimes after their leader, *Eunomians*. *Eunomius* (says Canon Robertson) discarded all mystery in religion; he held that "the Son resembles the Father in nothing; and that the Holy Spirit was created by the Son. He denied all Sacramental influences, and, unlike Arius, who was himself a man of rigid life, opposed anything like asceticism."

A middle party consisted of the *Acacians*, the followers of

Acacius, Bishop of Cæsarea ; but their principles lay light upon them, leading them at one time to the Semi-Arians, at another to the Anomæans, according to the circumstances of the times. The Third Sirmian Creed, known as the *Dated Creed* (Professor Bright says, because its heading recited the Consul of the year and the day of month), which was drawn up, A.D. 359, by some Acacians and Semi-Arians, repudiated altogether the word *οὐσία* (essence) as unscriptural, and confessed the Son to be "in all things *like* the Father, according to the Scriptures."

Constantius, baffled by the divisions amongst the Arians, and the resistance of the Catholics, resolved to make one more attack on the Faith of the Church, and to enforce his own views by means of a General Council. He accordingly summoned the Bishops of the East to meet at Seleucia, and those of the West at Ariminum or Rimini on the shores of the Hadriatic. The Seleucian Council met on September 27, A.D. 359, and was composed of one hundred and sixty Bishops, more than one hundred of whom were Semi-Arians, some followers of Acacius, and some Anomæans, with only a few Catholics. The Acacians wished the adoption of the *Dated Creed*, the Anomæans that of the *Dedication Creed*. The latter was ultimately adopted, but the Council, having sat a few days, after somewhat acrimonious debates, separated, without arriving at any practical conclusion.

The more important Council of Rimini, which met in May of the same year, was attended by more than four hundred Bishops (amongst whom were Hilary of Poitiers, and some Bishops from Britain), about eighty of the number being Arians. The Prefect of the City had received orders from the Emperor not to allow the Council to be dissolved before it came to a unanimous conclusion. The Council sat six months, and the arbitrary will of Constantius, and the sophistry of his minions, ultimately triumphed. Valens presented the Third Creed of Sirmium, and called upon the Bishops to adopt it on the

ground of its having received the Emperor's sanction. The majority of the Bishops objected that they were satisfied with the Nicene Creed, and did not require another, and they passed a resolution that the word "Substance, name and thing, should be retained." They wrote to Constantius requesting that no novelties should be introduced into the ancient faith; and that, inasmuch as many of them were worn with age and poverty, they might be allowed to return to their Dioceses before winter. Constantius, in his answer, proscribed the word *οὐσία* (essence) and the Homooousion. The orthodox party, being intimidated by the Emperor; fearing detention at Rimini during the winter; cajoled by the assurance of their opponents that their difference arose from a mere question of words; their patience gave way; they surrendered the words *οὐσία* and homooousion, and thereby they surrendered the Nicene Creed, and set their names to an uncatholic formula.

In 361, Constantius, who having like his father deferred his Baptism till the last, when he received it from the Arian Bishop of Antioch, died at the age of forty-four. He had set out on a war against his cousin Julian, whom the soldiers in Gaul had, against the Emperor's will, lately elected Augustus. Constantius was, when about ten miles from Tarsus in Cilicia, seized with the illness which carried him off, and was succeeded by Julian (361—363), to whom the title of *Apostate* has been accorded. In his reign the last great struggle between Christianity and Paganism occurred.

Hilary, after his return to Gaul (where he exerted himself at several Councils in undoing the mischief of the Council of Rimini), and the Gallican Bishops, in a Council held at Paris, declared that they had been deceived into signing the heretical Creed, and again adopted the Homooousion. The British Bishops also, on their return home, speedily abjured their unintentional heresy, and we find Athanasius himself, A.D. 363,

reckoning the British Church amongst those who were loyal to the Catholic faith.

Julian, born A.D. 331, who had been a pupil of Eusebius the Arian Bishop of Nicomedia, had received Baptism, and being thus outwardly, although not willingly, a Christian, he was even admitted to the lower Orders of the Church as Reader at Nicomedia. But Christianity, at a time when the Church was harassed by Arian Controversies, and the Creeds were undergoing constant alterations, so that it was a common saying amongst the Pagans that the Christians had yet to learn in what their faith consisted, presented little attraction to a philosophical mind like that of Julian. Through the interest of the Empress Eusebia he was sent to study in the schools of Athens, where two of his fellow-pupils were Basil of Cæsarea and Gregory of Nazianzum, and even at that early period of his life, Gregory predicted the misery which he would afterwards bring upon the Christian Church. Having before him the example of his cousin Constantius, the murderer of his relations, and the oppressor of his own youth, and the persecuting spirit of the Arians, he was prejudiced against Christianity, into which he had been forced against his will; he found in his two friends as zealous seekers after truth as he was himself, yet it was too late to change the hatred which he had imbibed of Christianity.

At Athens he showed himself a diligent student, an enthusiast in the Greek philosophy, and an admirer of the gods of Greece. As he grew older, his mind continued to be poisoned with the teaching of the heathen philosophers, and though he professed himself for some years a Christian, he by degrees threw off Christianity altogether (whence he is commonly called the Apostate), and as soon as he became Emperor, he, otherwise a man of high and unblemished character, determined to root out Christianity, and re-establish Paganism.

But Christianity had now grown too strong to be put down by the sword or fires of persecution, and Julian's own temper was

averse to cruelty. Experience had taught him that a general persecution only advanced Christianity; that the sufferings of the Martyrs had always led to the spread of the Christian faith, and he knew that the Christians were still ready to die in its cause. At the same time he felt that the old Paganism was effete, so he determined to reform it on the principles of Neo-Platonism which he himself held, and of Christianity. He issued an edict for toleration of all religions; the Pagans were ordered to rebuild their temples, and the Christian Bishops, who had been banished by his predecessor, were allowed to return to their Dioceses.

At the same time, he did everything in his power to oppress Christianity. He wrote a treatise against it. He denounced Baptism as a crime, as liable to cause divisions amongst his subjects and to alienate them from himself; he prohibited Christians from holding civil and military offices, and from following the medical profession; he confiscated the revenues of their churches; he forbade Greek and Roman literature from being taught in their schools, thinking thus to force them into the Pagan schools; "if," he said, "they do not believe the gods, let them not be instructed in the books which describe their deeds."

He took under his special protection any sect which was opposed to Christianity. He even entertained the extravagant idea of rebuilding the Temple at Jerusalem. He thought that, as the prophets in whom the Christians believed had foretold the everlasting ruin of the Temple, the reversal of the prophecy would inflict a fatal blow on Christianity. He therefore gave the Jews permission to rebuild the Temple. But this direct defiance of God's decree was signally defeated. The Jews, who had now acquired great wealth, came together from all parts to carry out the design, and it was said that women, rich and poor alike, the former carrying earth in their silken dresses, laboured at the work. A miracle, as described by SS. Ambrose,

Chrysostom, and Gregory of Nazianzum, intervened to stop the rash undertaking. An earthquake, a whirlwind, and a fiery eruption, scattered the foundations of the Temple. Ammianus, the Pagan biographer of Julian, wrote: "Horrible balls of fire, breaking out near the foundations, with reiterated attacks, rendered the place from time to time inaccessible to the scorched workmen, and after frequent repulses by the fiery elements, the undertaking was abandoned."

Athanasius, after the edict of Julian, returned to Alexandria, where the Pagan population, more incensed even than the Christians with the impious cruelty of the usurper, had, immediately after the death of Constantius, murdered George of Cappadocia. Another Arian who had been intruded into the See was, on the arrival of Athanasius, ejected. Athanasius at once set himself to the task of restoring peace to the city, and reconciling the discordant factions. Theodoret relates that the Pagan Priests represented to the Emperor that if he was allowed to remain in the city, not one worshipper of the gods would be left. On the ground that Athanasius had baptized some ladies of rank, and that his own edict was not intended to allow the Galilæans (as he contemptuously termed the Christians) to rebuild their churches, nor the Bishops to exercise their office, he again (A.D. 362) relegated him into banishment. Athanasius left the city with the remark that "it was only a little cloud which would soon pass away." He sailed up the Nile, and Julian sent a messenger in pursuit, with an order to kill him. Athanasius evaded his pursuers by an unexpected return to Alexandria: whence, after a short time, he withdrew to the deserts of Thebais, to find an asylum amongst his old friends the Monks, till the death of Julian.

That event occurred on June 26, A.D. 363, Julian, after a short reign of little more than eighteen months, being killed in a battle against the Persians.

Julian was the last of the family of Constantius, and on his

death, the Imperial Crown passed to Jovian (363—364), an obscure man, who was raised to his new dignity by the troops of his predecessor. The early Christian historians relate that Jovian, who was a Christian, a favourer of the Nicene Creed, and thus the first Catholic emperor, refused the unexpected honour till the whole army exclaimed that they were Christians, and that it was their will that he should accept it. On his march from the seat of war, after the conclusion of an inglorious peace with the Persians, he again inscribed on the Labarum the emblems of Christianity ; and as soon as he mounted the Imperial throne, he repealed the edicts of Julian, and whilst allowing full toleration to the Pagans, restored to the Christian Church its property and immunities. Athanasius at once returned from exile, and the attachment of Jovian to the Nicene faith was manifested by the veneration which he expressed to its great champion. During his short reign, the temporary triumph of Paganism under Julian melted away, and Christianity obtained a speedy and lasting victory. But on his way through Asia Minor to Constantinople, he was found dead in his bed after a short reign of eight months, suffocated, as was supposed, by a charcoal fire in his room, on February 17, A.D. 364.

Valentinian (364—375) his successor was a Catholic, who in the reign of Julian had shown a marked contempt for Paganism ; it was said that on one occasion when, in attendance on the Emperor, he was entering a Pagan Temple, he ventured to strike a Priest who sprinkled him with the lustral water. Thirty days after he became Emperor, he associated with himself his brother Valens (364—378), who had been, under Julian, a Catholic, but after his accession to the Empire, fell into Arianism, and treated the orthodox party with much cruelty. Valens became Emperor in the East, whilst Valentinian reserved for himself the government of the West.

Valentinian, who showed himself in other respects a pious Christian, had one besetting fault, a fierce and unrelenting

violence of temper, which indeed ultimately conducted to his death ; he also observed a wise and liberal toleration. A notable case occurred with regard to Auxentius, the Arian Bishop of Milan. When Valentinian was at Milan, it was represented to him that the Bishop was an Arian. The Emperor ordered a trial, and Auxentius confessed himself to be an adherent of the Arian Council of Rimini. Valentinian, who disliked theological discussions, professed himself satisfied with his defence, and Auxentius continued Bishop, his accuser, who was Hilary of Poitiers, being ordered to leave Milan. St. Hilary then returned to Poitiers.

Valens in the first years of his reign followed the tolerant course of his brother. He was still, like Valentinian, a Catechumen, but, A.D. 367, when on the eve of starting on a Gothic war, he was won over by his wife to Arianism, and persuaded to accept Baptism at the hands of Eudoxius, the Arian Bishop of Constantinople. After this event, Valens, whose feeble mind was swayed by those with whom he was immediately brought into contact, resigned his conscience to Arian guides, speaking of the orthodox party as the Athanasian *heretics*. On the death of Eudoxius, A.D. 370, Evagrius, whom the Catholics appointed, was driven out, and Demophilus, the nominee of the Arians, appointed to the Imperial See of Constantinople. We are told how on one occasion, when fourscore orthodox Bishops presented to Valens a petition at Constantinople, he ordered them to be put on ship-board and sent out to sea, and that a fire occurred in which they were all burnt to death, the sailors alone making good their own escape in boats. The fire might have been accidental, but the blame was attributed to the cruel malice of the Emperor, and his Arian allies.

In the year of his Baptism, Valens issued an edict for the expulsion of the Catholic Bishops, and an order was sent to the Prefect of Egypt for the ejection of Athanasius, who is said to have concealed himself for four months in the country,

in his father's sepulchre. This was his fifth exile. But the people of Alexandria were so urgent in his cause that Valens, fearing an insurrection, sanctioned his return. He was thus allowed to spend the last year of his life unmolested amongst his own people, dying A.D. 373, at the age of seventy-six years.

CHAPTER V.

THE VICTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

MONASTICISM. The Therapeutæ and Essenes—The Nazarites—Paul of Alexandria—St. Anthony—Advocated the cause of St. Athanasius—The Lauras—Monasticism introduced into the West by St. Athanasius—Pachomius—Famous Monks—Eu-ebius of Vercelli—John Cassian—St. Martin of Tours—St. Honoratus—St. Vincent of Lerins—The Pillar-Saints—Death of Liberius, Bishop of Rome—And of St. Hilary of Poitiers—Damasus, Bishop of Rome—St. Basil the Great—St. Gregory of Nyssa—St. Gregory Nazianzen—The Church of the Anastasia at Constantinople—Gregory Nazianzen appointed Bishop of Constantinople—St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan—The word Pagan—The Goths defeat the Emperor Valens at Hadrianople—The Gothic Bishop Ulphilas—Gratian, Emperor—Takes Theodosius as his colleague—The Council of Constantinople—Retirement of Gregory Nazianzen from Constantinople—Completion of the Nicene Creed—The Priscillianists—Great massacre at Thessalonica—Ambrose places Theodosius under the ban of the Church—Death of Theodosius—Honorius and Arcadius joint Emperors—Advance of the Church under Theodosius—Death of St. Ambrose—St. Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople—Council of the Oak—Chrysostom banished—His death—St. Jerome—His translation of the Scriptures—St. Augustine—His early life—Becomes a Manichaean—His mother Monica—His conversion—Death of Monica—Augustine becomes Bishop of Hippo—His controversies with Donatists and Pelagians—His *De Civitate Dei*—Siege of Hippo by the Vandals—Death of St. Augustine.

BEFORE parting with St. Athanasius, a short account must be given of Monasticism, in which he was so directly concerned, and which formed so important a feature in the history of the early and mediæval Church.

Monasticism was not peculiar to Christianity. There were several bodies amongst the Jews, who, before the birth of Christianity, formed themselves into communities of religious ascetics, such as the Essenes on the shores of the Dead Sea, and the Therapeutæ on the borders of Lake Mæotis in Egypt, where a large number of Jews had settled. Elijah and St. John the

Baptist were types of the solitary hermit life; and from the earliest times there existed a body of ascetics, like the Nazarites, who led a life of stricter observance than the ordinary Jew.

But it was in the Third Century and during the Decian persecution that Monasticism took its rise, or rather assumed a definite form, in the Christian Church. Pressure from Pagan persecution drove many Christians to seek a safe asylum in the remote deserts of Egypt, amongst whom was a young man of Alexandria, named Paul, who is known as the first *hermit*, or dweller in a desert (*ἐρημίτα*), who flying from persecution (A.D. 251) lived, according to St. Jerome, who wrote his life, in perfect solitude for ninety years.

But a still more famous hermit was St. Anthony (251—356), the Patriarch of Monks, a man born of wealthy Christian parents at Coma, a village on the borders of Upper Egypt, in the same year in which Paul entered on his hermit life. Losing his parents before he was twenty years of age, and left with a young sister, and a considerable independence; influenced by the example of the rich young man in the Gospel, who was told by Christ to sell all that he had, and give to the poor, he resolved to undergo a life of poverty, and dedicate himself to God. Placing his sister, as St. Athanasius his biographer says, in a house of Virgins (*παρθενώνα*), which may be considered the first mention made of a *Nunnery*, and having sold his possessions in order to distribute the money amongst the poor, he commenced a life of rigid asceticism near his native village, supporting himself by the labour of his own hands. Not succeeding in the avoidance of the sensual temptations which had long assailed him, he retired to a further distance, and took refuge in an old sepulchre, whither a friend brought him from time to time a little bread. Here, as the consequence of his austere fastings, he was seized with a severe illness; but animated still by feelings of devotion, he sought, about A.D. 285, a yet more distant retirement in a ruined castle on the top of the mountains near the Red Sea.

There he abode for twenty years, rarely seeing any man except the one who brought him bread once every six months. He, however, found himself still beset by the same temptations, and by demons in frightful shapes, who inflicted on him bodily chastisements, leaving him half dead.

In 305 he came down from the mountains, and founded his first monastery in the Thebais, or Upper Egypt. In 311 he went to Alexandria during a time of persecution, appearing in public in his white monastic dress, encouraging the Martyrs and Confessors in the mines and dungeons, accompanying them before the tribunals and at the place of execution. He himself, however, escaped the martyrdom which he courted, and after the persecution was ended, he sought a still more remote cell on the side of a mountain difficult of access, which possessed the advantage of a spring of cold water, the shade of a few palm trees, and a small patch of land which he himself cultivated to supply his own wants and the wants of those who visited him.

His fame spread abroad, and the deserts of Egypt began to swarm with devotees, many people, notwithstanding his longing for privacy, seeking him out to gain spiritual counsel. He strongly advocated the cause of St. Athanasius, and wrote to Constantine the Great urging him to recall him from exile; Constantine also and his sons wrote to him seeking his advice, and asking his prayers, and invited him, in vain, to the Court. The neighbourhood became covered with a cluster of cells, called Lauras, forming a religious community of Anchorites, and thus laying the rudiments of the cœnobitic life.

When he was ninety years of age he set out to seek in the deserts his even more aged brother-hermit, Paul. Paul was still living; but when Anthony re-visited his cell a few days afterwards, he found him, his body kneeling and his hands stretched out in prayer, but dead. Anthony lived a few years longer; in 351, when he was one hundred years of age, he paid a second visit to Alexandria in support of his friend Athanasius; he died a few

days before Athanasius himself sought a refuge in the desert, A.D. 356.

The life of St. Anthony written by St. Athanasius gave an impulse to Monasticism. Athanasius had been the means of introducing it from the East into the West, when he sought a refuge with Pope Julius at Rome. The strange dress, and the intensity of devotion of two monks who accompanied him, attracted the gaze of the Roman populace, and although it at first excited ridicule, it soon gained their reverence. Athanasius described to them the principles of the monastic life, and related the history of the famous hermit, St. Anthony. A rich lady named Marcella was so attracted by what she heard from him, that she founded a convent in Rome; thus the monastic system became firmly established, and from Rome spread to other cities in Italy.

St. Pachomius (292—348), like St. Anthony a native of the Thebaid, was the founder, or organizer, of the *cœnobitic* life, or the association of a number of monks in one building or monastery, under a regular system. He founded a monastery at Tabenne, an island of the Nile, of which he himself became the first Abbot, his sister becoming Abbess of a community of nuns. Eight other monasteries became attached to the community, which before his death numbered three thousand, and about fifty years afterwards, no fewer than fifty thousand inmates.

The monastic spirit spread rapidly, a great number of monks being found in every province, and soon in every city of the Empire. It found votaries in the most illustrious Fathers of the Church, SS. Athanasius (as we have already seen), in Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Martin of Tours, Jerome, Augustine of Hippo, and Gregory the Great.

It was introduced into Northern Italy by Eusebius of Vercelli^a, and shortly afterwards by St. Ambrose into Milan. John Cassian (360—433), a monk of Bethlehem, who is said to have

^a See p. 165.

been the founder of Semi-Pelagianism, a modified form of the Pelagian heresy^b, founded a monastery at Marseilles, of which he himself was Abbot, and which became the centre of Monasticism in Southern Gaul, and notably at Lerins.

At a still earlier period, Northern Gaul had received monasticism from St. Martin of Tours. Few Saints of the early Church have gained a greater celebrity than St. Martin (316—397), the "Apostle of Gaul" (France). The son of a Pagan Military Tribune, he himself served in the army of the future Emperor Julian. An interesting story is told of this period of his life. Whilst still a Catechumen, he met, during the frost of a severe winter, a poor man barely clad and trembling with cold, outside the walls of Milan. Money he had none to give him, but severing with his sword his military cloak into two parts, he gave one to the shivering beggar. In the following night the Saviour appeared to him, wearing the half cloak which he had thus disposed of, and saying, "See the cloak which Martin the Catechumen has given Me."

Desiring to serve God more thoroughly than his military duties permitted, he sought out Julian, and told him; "Cæsar, hitherto I have served you, henceforward I wish to be only Christ's soldier." Soon afterwards he was baptized, and abandoning his soldier's life after twenty years' service, and having visited St. Hilary of Poitiers, he retired to lead a hermit life on the Island of Gallinaria, an island with which travellers along the beautiful Cornice Road near Genoa are familiar.

In 371 he was consecrated Bishop of Tours, where he built a monastery, in which he continued to follow his monastic life, presiding over the monks as Bishop and Abbot. There, as well as in another monastery which he built at Poitiers, he made numerous converts; and thence, in company with his monks, he travelled through the Diocese, destroying the Pagan idols and temples and consecrated groves, building churches, and

^b See next Chapter.

founding monasteries. He died on November 8, A.D. 397. Various miracles were attributed to him, which it is not necessary to relate nor to believe; but the numerous churches which bear his name attest the reverence in which his memory has been ever held. St. Ninian, the Apostle of the Southern Picts, was consecrated by him a Bishop, and to him dedicated the first church *built of stone* in the British Isles.

Second only to St. Martin, as a missionary in Gaul, was St. Honoratus, who founded, A.D. 400, the famous Monastery of Lerins. In 426 he was consecrated Bishop of Arles, in which See he was succeeded by his relative and disciple, Hilary, at that time only twenty-nine years of age, and generally known as St. Hilary of Arles, to distinguish him from his namesake of Poitiers. St. Lupus, who we shall see presently accompanied St. German into Britain, and was afterwards consecrated Bishop of Troyes, had been a monk of Lerins; as also was St. Vincent, who is known by his surname of Lerinensis, to whom the authorship of the Hymn *Quicumque Vult*, commonly known as the Athanasian Creed, has been attributed.

Nor, whilst on this subject, must we omit the Stylites, or Pillar-Saints, who voluntarily submitted to a life-long torture, on the summit of a lofty pillar. Most famous of the number was the Syrian Anchorite, St. Simeon. Forsaking, at the age of thirteen, his shepherd's life, he is said to have lived, from A.D. 423, for thirty years, with a weighty chain attached to his body, on the summit of a pillar about a yard in diameter, and raised some sixty feet from the ground, at a place about forty miles from Antioch. There, taking only one scanty meal during the week, and fasting entirely in Lent, through the scorching heat of summer and the freezing cold of winter, he preached to the multitudes that came to him, reconciling enemies, exhorting to repentance, and making converts to the Church. There is no question but that in his lifetime he was not only an object of reverence, but that he was consulted as an

oracle ; pilgrims from distant lands resorted to him ; Bishops, and Emperors, and the King of Persia, sought his advice. "Habit and exercise," says Gibbon, "instructed him to maintain his dangerous position without fear or giddiness, and successively to assume the different positions of devotion. He sometimes prayed in an erect attitude with out-stretched arms, and in a figure of a Cross ; but his familiar practice was that of bending his meagre skeleton from the forehead to the feet ; and a curious spectator, after numbering twelve hundred and forty-four positions, at length desisted from the endless account . . . and the patient hermit expired, without descending from his column."

He was succeeded in his honour of Stylite by St. Daniel, a native of Mesopotamia, who erected his pillar four miles North of Constantinople, which he occupied for forty years, dying A.D. 494 at the age of eighty.

We must now return to the point where the continuous history of the Church was broken off.

Peter, who had been the faithful follower of Athanasius, and recommended by him as his successor, was by the unanimous voice of the Catholic Bishops elected to the See of Alexandria. The Arians, however, elected Lucius, who had been his bitter opponent ; Peter was imprisoned, and the Catholic Bishops banished. Peter afterwards escaped, and found an asylum with Damasus, Bishop of Rome, from whence he was soon enabled to return, and take possession of the Diocese.

Liberius, Bishop of Rome, who after his return from banishment repented of his fall under the Arian heresy, and of his condemnation of St. Athanasius, in a letter to the Eastern Bishops, represented all the Bishops of the West as having disavowed the Creed of Rimini, and having returned to the Nicene faith. He died A.D. 366, and in 368 the Church lost one of the chief champions of orthodoxy, by the death of St. Hilary of Poitiers.

On the death of Liberius a disgraceful schism occurred in the

Roman Church, caused by two rival candidates for the Papacy, Damasus and Ursicinus. The adherents of the latter assembled in the Basilica of St. Sisinus (probably the present Sta. Maria Maggiore), where they were attacked by the partizans of Damasus, who, it is asserted, himself took part in the fray, at the head of a motley band of Clergy and gladiators. The Emperor was appealed to; the Prefect of the City, unable to appease the tumult, was obliged to seek safety in flight; but the victory rested with Damasus (366—384), whose election was confirmed, but only after one hundred and sixty dead bodies, all of them of the party of Ursicinus, were left in the church.

The election of Damasus shows that the Papacy had now become an object of ambition; it had also thrown off its primitive simplicity, and was marked by luxurious living and worldly-mindedness, which became the scoff of the Pagans. There is no reason to doubt the impartiality of the Pagan historian, Ammianus, when he speaks of the Roman Pontiffs, proceeding in their chariots through the streets of Rome, of their profuse sumptuousness, and of their expensive luxury, surpassing that of the Imperial table. How much more, he says, would they consult their true happiness, if they imitated some of the provincial Bishops, "whose temperance and sobriety recommended them to the Deity, and His true worshippers." Another Pagan, the Prefect of Rome, said to Damasus, "Make me Bishop of Rome, and I promise to become a Christian."

The mantle of St. Athanasius fell, in the East, on three natives of Cappadocia, S. Basil the Great (circ. 330—379), Bishop of Cæsarea; his brother Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa (died circ. 399); and the intimate friend of the former, Gregory Nazianzen (circ. 325—389), Bishop, first of Sasima, and afterwards of Constantinople.

St. Basil was born of Christian parents, his father being a lawyer of repute, at Cæsarea, and having been educated there and at Constantinople, where he studied Rhetoric under the

celebrated heathen Rhetorician, Libanius, was afterwards sent to the famous school of Athens, where he had for his fellow-pupils Gregory Nazianzen, and Julian the future Emperor. Here Julian studied with them, not only the works of heathen philosophy and the Greek and Latin writers, but also the Holy Scriptures. Neither Basil nor Gregory were baptized till after they left Athens. Basil after leaving Athens, determined to devote himself to the service of God, and having for a time taught as a Rhetorician and Christian Sophist in his native town, was attracted by the fervour of the monastic life, to visit the most celebrated monasteries in Palestine and Egypt. About A.D. 357, he embraced the life of a monk at Pontus, where he induced Gregory to join him. There he built a monastery, around which several other monasteries sprang up in the neighbouring provinces, of which he assumed the superintendence, not adopting the life of the solitary anchorite but the cœnobitic system, as being more conducive to religious discipline. He drew up a body of rules, in which task he was assisted by St. Gregory, for his new societies, and St. Basil's Rule is to the present day universally followed by the Eastern Monks. He himself observed the strictest asceticism; he reduced the meals of the monks to one only, and that of bread and water, during the day; they were to rise at midnight, and devote the rest of the night to prayer.

In 362 he returned to Cæsarea, and was ordained a Reader. His zeal for orthodoxy subjected him to the wrath of Julian, who had now become Emperor; in vain Julian threatened him; Basil reminded him of the time when they had studied the Scriptures together, and contrasted it with the present time when Julian had been raised by demons to so proud a height, that he lifted himself against God.

Having been in 364 ordained Priest by the Bishop of Cæsarea, he was, A.D. 369, mainly through the interest of his friend Gregory, himself consecrated Bishop of that Metropolitan See, which he

administered so successfully as to draw upon himself the anger of the Arian Emperor, Valens. The Prefect of Cappadocia was sent to threaten him with confiscation of his property (all of which, however, he had sold for the poor), with banishment, and with torture, unless he consented to accept the Creed of the Emperor. As to loss of property, Basil told him, he had only a single suit of ragged clothes and a few books. As to banishment, wherever God was, there was the Christian's home. As to torture, his body was so weak that the first blow would kill him, and death would be a kindness, as it would take him at once to God.

A fabulous story is told of his miraculously curing the Emperor's infant son, and how, on Valens afterwards refusing to fulfil the promise which he then made, that the infant should receive orthodox Baptism, the child died. Other equally fabulous stories are related. Anyhow, Basil escaped the vengeance of Valens, and living till the reign of Gratian, died on January 1, A.D. 379, at the age of forty-nine.

St. Gregory of Nyssa, the younger brother of St. Basil, was, although a married man, appointed by him, A.D. 371, to the Bishopric of Nyssa in Cappadocia; being deposed in 376, during the persecution of Valens, he was again restored to his Diocese under Gratian. He attended the Council of Constantinople, in which he took a leading part, and is said to have been the author of the enlarged Creed drawn up at that Council. He probably died in the last year of the Fourth Century.

More eventful than the lives of either of the two preceding was that of St. Gregory Nazianzen, a man pre-eminent amongst his cotemporaries in every branch of learning. Gregory, a native of Arianza, near Nazianzum, was the son of the Bishop of that See, born (there is every reason to believe) after his father became a Bishop; and his pious wife Nonna. After being educated, first at Cæsarea and then at Alexandria, where St. Athanasius was then Bishop, he completed his education at Athens.

After leaving the school of Athens, and the monastic retreat of St. Basil, he was, much against his will, ordained (A.D. 361) by his father, who had subscribed the Arian Creed of Rimini, but whom he was able to draw over to the side of Athanasius.

Basil, who was Metropolitan of Cappadocia, feeling that his Province required the erection of new Sees, established a Bishopric at Sasima, a dirty and unhealthy and altogether objectionable town, quite unsuited for a man of an intellectual and sensitive mind like that of Gregory. Moreover, Anthimus, the neighbouring Bishop of Tyana, a place about thirty miles from Sasima, had offended Basil by claiming for himself the rank of Metropolitan, and was unlikely to be favourably disposed to a Bishop whom he regarded as an intruder. But Basil, without considering the fitness of the Bishop to the place or the place to the Bishop, forced the See on Gregory, who, in obedience to his father's wishes, reluctantly accepted it, and was consecrated Bishop. But thus the life-long affection between Basil and Gregory was interrupted; Gregory, however, was prevented by Anthimus from entering the Diocese, and returning to his aged father, he assisted him till the death of the latter, A.D. 374, after which he himself continued to administer the business of the Diocese.

In the year of Basil's death, A.D. 379, Gregory accepted an invitation from the small party of orthodox Christians at Constantinople, to undertake a mission to that city, which was almost entirely in the hands of Arians. A spacious room was set apart for his services, to which the name Anastasia (*resurrection*) was given, to signify the resurrection of the Nicene faith. Here he gained the title of the *Theologian*; people of all classes, and amongst them many Arians, crowded to hear him, and the Anastasia soon grew into a magnificent church. But a violent opposition was raised against him by the main body of the Arians; riots ensued, the gates of the church were broken open, and great damage, and even blood-shedding, was perpetrated.

In November, A.D. 380, the Emperor Theodosius visited Constantinople ; Demophilus the Bishop was deposed for refusing to sign the Nicene Creed, and Gregory placed on the archiepiscopal throne by the Emperor himself ; the orthodox party was put in possession of the churches of the city ; and thus Arianism, which had prevailed in Constantinople, was arrested. The part he bore in the Council of Constantinople will be mentioned hereafter.

If the cause of orthodoxy found valiant champions in the East, no less able a champion did it find in the West, in the great St. Ambrose, who A.D. 374 succeeded the Arian Bishop Auxentius in the See of Milan.

Ambrose (circ. 340—397) descended from a noble Roman family, a son of a Prefect of Gaul of the same name, having studied the practice of the Law at Rome, was afterwards appointed Governour of Liguria, with his residence in the chief city, Milan. On the death of Auxentius, a dispute occurred between the Arian and orthodox party as to his successor, and Ambrose, in his capacity as Governour, was present in the Cathedral of Milan, which was crowded by people for the election. Suddenly the voice of a little child was heard, “Ambrose, Bishop ;” the words were eagerly caught up by the whole assembly, both Arians and Catholics, and Ambrose, who was as yet only a Catechumen, was unanimously, although much against his will, elected Bishop. The choice was approved by the Emperor Valentinian, and Ambrose, at that time thirty-four years of age, was within ten days baptized and consecrated a Bishop, and having sold his property for distribution amongst the Clergy and the poor, thenceforward devoted himself entirely to the study of the Scriptures and theology, and to the work of his diocese.

Valentinian died A.D. 375. In a law passed in his reign, the word *Pagan* (which, as being a well-known appellation of the Heathen, we have anticipated), was first used. The word, thus

legalised, marks an epoch in the progress of Christianity. Paganism, driven from the large and populous towns, had taken refuge in the villages (*pagi*), whence its followers were called *Pagans*, or dwellers in villages.

In 376, an event occurred fraught with important consequences to Christianity and the Roman Empire. A Teutonic tribe, the Visigoths, or Western Goths, who inhabited Dacia, had hitherto been held back from the Roman territory by the strong fortresses of the Danube ; but being hard pressed by their formidable neighbours, the Huns, requested permission through their Bishop Ulfilas, to take refuge on the Roman side of the river. The weak Emperor Valens, no longer restrained by the wisdom and authority of Valentinian, gave them the fatal permission ; but at the same time clogged with such humiliating and disgraceful conditions, as to excite in the camp of the barbarians a spirit of discontent, which cancelled every feeling of gratitude, and rendered them, instead of allies, the enemies of Rome. They were soon joined by an army of Ostrogoths, or Eastern Goths ; so that it was calculated that not fewer than two hundred thousand Gothic warriors were transported into Mœsia ; and thus an independent and hostile camp was formed in the territory of the Roman Empire.

Quarrels soon arose, and the battle of Hadrianople was fought on August 9, A.D. 378, between the Goths and Romans. The Romans suffered such a crushing defeat that it was compared to that of Cannæ ; and Valens, with two-thirds of his army, fell under the arms of the victors.

The Goths had been the first of the German nations to embrace Christianity. Many Christians, amongst whom were several Clergy, had been carried away prisoners by the Goths of the Upper Danube, who had ravaged Asia, A.D. 268, in the reign of Gallienus. The captives, says Dean Milman, subdued their conquerors, and the gentle doctrines of Christianity found their way into the hearts of the barbarian warriors. We have

seen that a Gothic Bishop, Theophilus, attended the great Council of Nice, A.D. 325. Ulfilas, who succeeded him, A.D. 348, had, as might be expected, hazy notions of the distinction between orthodoxy and Arianism, and appears to have thought himself orthodox in signing the Creed of Rimini; but during his visit to the Arian Valens, he became confirmed in the doctrines of Arianism. Ulfilas, the Apostle of the Goths, as he was called, exercised an unbounded influence on them; he composed an alphabet, and translated the Scriptures into the Gothic language (the oldest Teutonic writing which is extant), and through him, the whole nation, both Visigoths and Ostrogoths, was induced to embrace the Arian Creed. From them, Arianism spread through the other barbarian tribes of Germany, the Vandals and Burgundians, matter of the greatest consequence, for Arianism thus became the Creed of the nations which were soon to become the conquerors of the Roman Empire.

The death of Valens was a gain to Christianity. Arianism lost its champion, and thenceforward, although not completely extirpated from the Roman Empire, was relegated to the Goths and other barbarous tribes, amongst whom it found a temporary accession of strength, but came to be regarded as a barbarous and foreign religion.

Gratian (367—383) the son of Valentinian, at first reigned as joint Emperor with his father, but on the death of Valens succeeded to the government of the whole Empire. The army gave him a nominal colleague in his half-brother, Valentinian II., a child only four years of age, he himself being sixteen. Ambrose at once gained a powerful influence on the two young Emperors, but the Empress Justina, the mother of Valentinian II., was an Arian, and a persistent foe of Ambrose and the Catholics.

Gratian, a man of feeble and indolent disposition, but a pious and amiable Prince, although his father had entrusted his education to the Pagan teacher, Ausonius, soon became thoroughly

indoctrinated by Ambrose in the principles of the Catholic faith. He refused to accept the title of Pontifex Maximus, as unbecoming a Christian Emperor, and he recalled the exiled Bishops of the East. But in dealing with other religions he was less tolerant than his predecessors, Jovian and Valentinian, and, supported by Ambrose, who told him he should not countenance customs which were hateful to God, he inflicted on Paganism a heavier blow than any which it had yet encountered. He ordered the altar of the goddess of Victory in the Forum of Rome, which had been before removed by Constantius but restored by Julian, to be again removed, and subjected the Pagan worshippers to deprivation of their funds, and the loss of many privileges which had hitherto been accorded to them. The Donatists also he ordered to surrender their churches to the Catholics.

Feeling the need of an experienced colleague against the encroachments of the Goths, he conferred the government of the East upon Theodosius, a Spaniard, who was a Catholic, although as yet only a Catechumen. His father, also named Theodosius, had done good service as a Roman General in Africa, but, probably with the sanction of Gratian, had suffered the punishment of death. The patriotic spirit, which, notwithstanding this wrong, animated the Son, only adds another trait to the noble character of Theodosius, who afterwards married Gratian's half-sister, Galla.

In the first year of his reign (379—395), Theodosius received Baptism at the hands of Acholius, the orthodox Bishop of Thessalonica; and now for the first time the whole Roman world was governed by orthodox Emperors, whilst the pious and catholic Bishop Ambrose exerted the greatest and widest influence of all the contemporary Bishops.

In January, 381, Theodosius issued an edict restoring all their churches to the Catholic Bishops, and confining the name of Catholic to those who held the faith of the co-essential and co-equal Trinity, as taught by those saintly Prelates, Damasus

of Rome, and Peter of Alexandria. All others were to be accounted heretics, and were liable to severe punishment.

On May 2, of the same year, met the Second General Council, or First of Constantinople, which, although entirely composed of Eastern Bishops, was recognised by Damasus, Bishop of Rome, and has always been accepted in the West as Œcumenical.

The principal objects which the Emperor had in view in summoning the Council, were to put an end to the troubles which some Egyptian Bishops had caused by consecrating a Cynic philosopher named Maximus, in opposition to the canonical Bishop, Gregory Nazianzen, to the See of Constantinople, on the ground that the latter had been translated from another Diocese; and to settle the Apollinarian and Macedonian heresies.

Apollonius, who (A.D. 362) was consecrated to the See of Laodicea, had been a friend of St. Athanasius to the time of the latter's death, and an eminent defender of the Faith against the Arians and other heretics. But even in the lifetime of Athanasius, though still more openly after his death, he asserted that, although Christ in assuming man's nature, took a real Body, yet that the rational Soul was supplied by the Divine Logos, whence it followed that the Divine Nature combined with the human suffered death upon the Cross.

The Macedonians derived their name from Macedonius, who, a Semi-Arian, was, A.D. 351, appointed by Constantius to the See of Alexandria. He founded a Sect called the Pneumatomachi (*opponents of the Spirit*), who denied the Divine Nature of the Holy Ghost. The heresy had been held by the Arians, but as it had not been then prominently brought forward, it was not referred to in the Canons of the Council of Nice.

The Council of Constantinople was attended by one hundred and fifty Bishops from the East, thirty-six being Macedonian Bishops. Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, was appointed to preside. By the fourth Canon, after an enquiry had been made

into the election of Maximus to the See of Constantinople, it having been decided that he had not been rightly consecrated, Maximus was deposed, and the election of Gregory was confirmed. Meletius having died whilst the Council was sitting, Gregory took his place as President.

A recent schism which had arisen from a double election of Paulinus and Meletius to the See of Antioch had been settled by an agreement that the survivor should be accounted sole Bishop. Gregory thought that this stipulation ought now to be observed; but the Asiatic Bishops consecrated Flavian as successor to Meletius.

After the Council had commenced, Timothy, who had succeeded his brother Peter in the See of Alexandria, arrived with the Egyptian Bishops, who were deeply grieved that the Council had commenced without them, as also at the confirmation of Gregory in the See of Constantinople; and they, reviving the claims of Maximus, resolved to depose him. Nor were the Asiatics better disposed towards Gregory from his having opposed the election of Flavian to the See of Antioch.

Gregory had unwillingly accepted the See, and had only done so in the hopes of conciliating the Asiatic and Western Bishops; but he had signally failed. Though his success in preaching had brought over many converts from the Arians, he was more successful in the pulpit than as an administrator. Worn out with the troubles which he had to encounter, and with which a man of his gentle character was ill-suited to cope, he now to the regret of Theodosius, but not apparently to that of the Council, (which is the more to be wondered at, inasmuch as it had confirmed him in the Bishopric), went back to Nazianzum. But Maximus was not reinstated; Nectarius, a Catechumen, who at the time held a high civil appointment, was selected by Theodosius; he was forthwith baptized, and was consecrated whilst still in his Baptismal robes; to be succeeded in the See after sixteen years by the great St. Chrysostom.

Gregory, on his road to Nazianzum, visited Cæsarea, where he pronounced a funeral oration over St. Basil ; a proof that no permanent ill-feeling existed between them. He then resumed the episcopal charge of Nazianzum till a regular Bishop was consecrated to the See, and died A.D. 289. "The title of Saint," says Gibbon, who, strangely enough, was an admirer both of him and St. Athanasius, "has been added to his name ; but the tenderness of his heart, and the eloquence of his genius, reflect a more pleasing lustre on the memory of Gregory Nazianzen."

The first canon of the Council of Constantinople anathematised the heresies of the Macedonians, and Apollinarians. Apollinarius notwithstanding retained his Diocese till his death, A.D. 392.

The First General Council, that at Nice, having sat before the foundation of Constantinople, had recognised three principal Sees, those of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria. Since then Constantine had raised New Rome, or Constantinople, to the rank of the Imperial City. The third canon of the Council of Constantinople now enacted, that "the Bishop of Constantinople have the prerogative of honour, next after the Bishop of Rome, for Constantinople is New Rome." This canon was not accepted by the Church of Rome till the Pontificate of Innocent III. ; but by this canon the prerogative of the Bishops of Constantinople was much enhanced, and was soon still further advanced by the appointment of the great St. Chrysostom to the See.

The Nicene Creed was brought by the Council nearly to its present form, so that it has sometimes been called the Creed of Constantinople. The new clauses which were now added were ;—"Before all worlds ;"—"From Heaven ;"—"By the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary ;"—"Was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate ; And was buried ;"—"Sitteth on the right hand of the Father ;"—"Whose Kingdom shall have

no End." And all the clauses following the words, "And in the Holy Ghost," except the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son (*Filioque: and the Son*), which was not inscribed in the Creed till the Council of Toledo in Spain, A.D. 589.

The indolence of Gratian having caused discontent and insubordination in the army, he, A.D. 383, deserted by his troops, met with an ignominious death at Lyons, in a rebellion fomented in Britain under Maximus, who assumed the sovereignty of Britain, Gaul, and Spain, Valentinian being left in that of Italy, Africa, and Western Illyricum.

Under the usurping Emperor Maximus, death as the punishment of religious opinion was for the first time inflicted at the hands of the Christians. Priscillian, a noble and wealthy Spaniard, who held Gnostic and Sabellian errors, was consecrated to the See of Avila by two Bishops whom he had gained over to his side. Having been, A.D. 380, condemned by the Synod of Saragossa, he was, A.D. 385, accused of heresy before Maximus at Treves. St. Martin of Tours, who happened to be there at the time, interceded for him and his followers, on the ground that ecclesiastical offences should not be tried by civil judges, and obtained a promise from Maximus that their lives should be spared. No sooner, however, had St. Martin left Treves than, a confession of guilt having been extorted from them under torture, the Priscillianists were put to death. So incensed was St. Ambrose, that when he went to Treves, at the request of the young Emperor Valentinian, to obtain the body of his murdered brother Gratian, he refused to hold communion with Maximus and the Bishops who were concerned in this act of blood, which had sent a thrill of horror alike through the Christian and Pagan world.

After the death of Gratian, the Empress Justina, who was glad to avail herself of the offices of Ambrose as guardian to her son, prevailed on him to intercede with Maximus to ward off a threatened attack on Valentinian. Gratitude, however, did not

mitigate her hostility to Ambrose and the orthodox Church. Through her influence an edict was passed, conceding freedom of worship to the adherents of the Arian Creed of Rimini, whilst the Catholic party were threatened with punishment and even death. About the same time she demanded from Ambrose the use of one of the churches at Milan for Arian worship. Ambrose refused; a Bishop, he said, could not alienate what was consecrated to God; the people of Milan were on his side, and the Empress dared not proceed further against so powerful an opponent.

Maximus having (A.D. 387) invaded Italy, the young Emperor and his mother sought the protection of Theodosius; the latter avenged the murder of Gratian by the defeat in battle of Maximus, who was murdered by his own soldiers.

In 388 Justina died; Valentinian, who had long in his heart entertained a filial reverence for Ambrose, now openly went over to the side of orthodoxy, and from that time Paganism declined in the Roman Empire.

Whilst the Roman Church was yet in comparative obscurity, the Church under Ambrose exercised an authority hitherto unknown. He who in order to allay human misery, on one occasion sold, for the redemption of captives, the ornaments and consecrated vessels of the Church, on the ground that they were hallowed "not for the service of the Church alone but for the redemption of men," was equally firm in exercising the authority of the Church over so powerful an Emperor as the great Theodosius.

Theodosius, after he had avenged the murder of Gratian, took up his residence at Milan, where he put himself under the direction of St. Ambrose. When the Emperor was about to take his seat within the chancel rails, Ambrose stopped him and requested him to occupy, like other worshippers, a place in the body of the church. Theodosius obeyed, and when he was afterwards at Constantinople, observed the same practice.

But a more important circumstance, as showing the long strides the Church had made since the days of persecution, and the moral control it was now able to exercise over an Emperor, occurred, A.D. 388, at Thessalonica. The people having incurred the just wrath of Theodosius through a riot which had occurred in their city, Ambrose, well knowing the violent paroxysms of temper to which he was subject, and fearing that some dreadful act of vengeance on his part might be the consequence, exacted from the Emperor a promise of pardon. But Theodosius yielding to the violent counsels of his secular advisers, took a treacherous and inexcusable vengeance. The inhabitants, having been invited in his name to witness some games in the circus, were, on a given signal, attacked by the soldiers, and for three hours the city was given up to a fearful and indiscriminate slaughter of people of both sexes and of all ages. As many as seven thousand, by one report, and fifteen thousand according to other writers, fell victims to this cruel massacre. A thrill of horror spread over the Christian world. Ambrose, filled with sorrow, retired into the country, from whence he wrote to the Emperor, who was also absent from Milan, exhorting him to repentance, since otherwise he could not be admitted to Communion.

Theodosius returned to Milan, overwhelmed with the reproaches of his own conscience; and perhaps thinking that sufficient, was about to enter the Cathedral, when Ambrose, stopping him in the porch, refused him admittance, as one polluted with innocent blood. The Emperor signified his repentance, and pleaded in defence the deep sin of David, the man after God's own heart. But, said Ambrose, David also *repented*; mere words were not enough; the Emperor must undergo the penance of the Church. Theodosius readily accepted the conditions imposed upon him. For eight months he was kept under the humiliating ban of exclusion from the Church. When Christmas came, stripped of his Imperial robes,

and assuming the dress of a penitent, he publicly did penance in the Cathedral of Milan, prostrating himself on the ground, and watering the pavement with his tears. Still Ambrose refused to give him absolution, until the Emperor should issue an edict, commanding a respite of thirty days before the execution of sentences affecting life or property, in order thereby to prevent a recurrence of undue haste or passion for the future. He then granted him absolution; and we are told that the Emperor never passed a day for the remainder of his life, without lamenting the crime, into which he had been so carelessly and hastily drawn.

The young Emperor Valentinian, when he was only fourteen years of age, was on May 15, A.D. 392, found strangled in his residence at Vienne in Gaul. As was too often the custom in those times, he had deferred his Baptism, and so died unbaptized. St. Ambrose, who was overwhelmed with grief at his loss, in a funeral sermon preached in the Cathedral of Milan, commemorated his many virtues; whilst he consoled his mourning sisters with the assurance that the desire for Baptism was equivalent to the Sacrament, and that he had been baptized by his piety as Martyrs were by their blood.

Theodosius, who was now left, from A.D. 392—395, sole ruler of the Roman Empire, died in the latter year at the age of fifty, leaving the Empire to his two sons, whom he confided to the care of St. Ambrose, Honorius and Arcadius, of whom the former ruled over the West, the latter over the East. His reign was more important to Christianity than that of any of his predecessors since Constantine. Among the benefactors of the Church, says Gibbon, the fame of Constantine was rivalled by the glory of Theodosius. "If Constantine erected the standard of the Cross, Theodosius subdued the Arian heresy, and abolished Paganism."

A series of persecuting acts against Paganism and the various denominations of sectaries were, not without the approval of St. Ambrose, passed in his reign. The Pagan sacrifices were

prohibited, the idols were destroyed, and the Temples throughout the empire closed. The Arians were forced to give up their Churches, and all Bishops and Clergy, under threat of punishment, were called upon to subscribe the Nicene Faith. By such means the orthodox faith was established in all the Provinces of the Roman Empire.

Such intolerant acts as these could not subserve the interests of Christianity, as many people were induced to embrace it from fear rather than conviction. He used weapons drawn from the armoury of the Pagans, and little suited to the gentle spirit of the Gospel. The Pagan Sophist Libanius, writing A.D. 384, whilst wrongly attributing all the calamities of the times to the change of religion, appealed to the consciences of Christians, that religion should not be a matter of compulsion, but of conviction.

St. Ambrose died on April 4, A.D. 397, two years after Theodosius. To him the Church is indebted for the introduction of antiphonal singing in the services; and in the present day, at Milan, the Ambrosian chant, instead of the Gregorian which prevails in other Churches of Italy, is still in vogue. To him also the *Te Deum* is commonly ascribed, and also a Liturgy, differing from that of Rome, with which the Milanese have always refused to part.

He left his Diocese thoroughly purged from Arianism; as he himself says, not one citizen of Milan was infected by it, except a few Goths, and some members of the Imperial Palace. He was buried under the High Altar of the Ambrosian Basilica at Milan, and is reckoned with SS. Jerome, Augustine of Hippo, and Pope Gregory I., as one of the four Great Doctors of the Western Church.

Never, in an equal space of time, have so many illustrious names adorned the Post-Apostolic Church, as in the Fourth Century. The last blood of the Christian martyrs under the persecutions of the Roman Empire had been shed in the

Diocletian persecution ; and who can doubt that this noble band of Saints was raised up with the providential purpose of watering the seed which their blood had planted? (*Sanguis martyrū Semen Ecclesiæ.*)

Some of this goodly number we have already mentioned in this chapter ; other names equally great remain to be noticed.

The name of St. Chrysostom (347—407) is familiar to all English Churchmen from the prayer in our Service-book, entitled “A Prayer of St. Chrysostom.” His real name was John, and the name of Chrysostom, or *of the golden mouth* (Χρῦσος, στόμα), was given him soon after his death on account of his eloquence. A native of Antioch, and of illustrious birth, his father Secundus holding a high military rank in Syria, his education was, on the early death of his father, committed to his pious mother Anthusa, who instilled into him the principles of the Christian faith. Having studied Rhetoric under the famous Sophist Libanius, (who lamented on his death-bed, about A.D. 390, that the Christianity of Chrysostom prevented his succeeding him in the Pagan school of Rhetoric), he at first pleaded at the bar, and the highest dignities of the Empire seemed to be within his reach. But he determined to renounce the world and become a monk. From this, however, he was for a time dissuaded by his mother ; and having been baptized when he was rather over twenty years of age, and ordained a Reader by Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, he continued to reside with his mother until her death, practising the rigid asceticism of a monk, and devoting himself to the study of the Scriptures.

On her death, having before prevailed on two of his fellow-pupils in the school of Libanius also to embrace the ascetic life, he, A.D. 374, withdrew from the city and lived amongst the mountains of Antioch ; first for four years in a Monastery, and afterwards for two years as a hermit in a cave, until his health having broken down, he was compelled to return to Antioch. Here he was (A.D. 381) ordained Deacon by Meletius, and, five

years afterwards, Priest by Flavian, who had succeeded to the See of Antioch, by whom he was appointed Vicar and principal preacher in the city. Here he laboured, amidst a dissolute and pleasure-loving population of one hundred thousand souls, for twelve years, abolishing abuses, and entirely changing the aspect of the city, so that his reputation as a preacher spread throughout the whole Roman Empire.

In 398, three years after the death of Theodosius, he was appointed as the successor of Nectarius in the See of Constantinople. Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, fearing to find in Chrysostom a more zealous Bishop than suited his views, when called upon to consecrate him, at first refused, and only did so under compulsion of Eutropius, the chief adviser of the Emperor Arcadius, who threatened to expose his many misdemeanours in his See.

The See of Constantinople had suffered under the lax discipline of Nectarius, who was more adapted to the life of a civilian than of a Bishop, and who had reluctantly and at an advanced age accepted the See. Under him the Clergy had grown dissolute, and were accused of various crimes, not excepting murder, adultery, and entertaining "spiritual sisters." The third canon of the Council of Nice had strictly forbidden the unmarried Clergy, whether Bishops, Priests or Deacons, to entertain in their houses any women, under pretence of their being disciples, except a mother, or sister, or aunt, or some such like near relation. That this canon did not forbid the Clergy to live with their lawful wives, is evident from a subsequent law, which was made in pursuance of the Nicene canon, forbidding the Clergy to relinquish their wives to whom they had been married before their Ordination (*quæ ante sacerdotium legitimum meruere conjugium*). But notwithstanding the Nicene canon, the Clergy still continued to retain in their houses *sisters*, commonly some virgins employed in the services of the Church, who were known as *strangers* (συνηισακτοί,

the derivation of which word is doubtful); a custom which, however innocent it might have been, rendered them open to suspicion and brought scandal on the Church. This was one of the evils which Chrysostom set himself to reform.

Amongst the better classes, he soon gained even a stronger influence than he had at Antioch, especially against Arianism, which still continued to lurk amongst the Goths of Constantinople; whilst a great moral improvement was effected in the city. But the popularity which he gained as a preacher, added to a somewhat hot and vehement temper, led him on, in his castigation of the prevalent vices, to use unguarded expressions, which admitted of an unfavourable construction, and raised up against him many enemies. The Clergy and those of the higher classes whose vices he assailed, the courtiers, and even the Empress Eudoxia herself, were incensed against him. Chrysostom was not a sociable and far from a hospitable man. He eschewed the luxurious mode of living of his predecessor, preferring a simple and quiet life, with his scanty meal in his solitary chamber. He was certainly not "given to hospitality," as St. Paul says a Bishop ought to be. Many of the neighbouring Clergy and Bishops who visited Constantinople thought that on this ground they had a grievance against him.

One enemy in particular was Theophilus, the turbulent and unscrupulous Patriarch of Alexandria, who felt jealous of the precedence given by the Second Council to the See of Constantinople over his own Diocese. Theophilus had been summoned to appear before a council appointed by the Emperor to answer to certain charges which were preferred against him. Instead of appearing as a defendant, he assumed the role of prosecutor against Chrysostom; and, A.D. 403, passing over to the Asiatic shore opposite to Constantinople, attended by his nephew Cyprian, and supported by two Deacons whom Chrysostom had deposed, he summoned him to appear before a council at

a place called the Oak, near Chalcedon. Chrysostom refused to appear before a council which had no right to try him, and which was mostly composed of Egyptian Bishops under the control of Theophilus. Several false charges were brought against him, one being of high treason in reviling the Empress Eudoxia, a woman beautiful indeed, but of by no means unblemished character, whom he had rendered his bitter enemy. The triumph of Theodosius was complete; Chrysostom was condemned, the sentence of the punishment being left to the weak Emperor Arcadius, who, acting under the influence of Eudoxia, sentenced him to deposition and banishment.

No sooner, however, had he left Constantinople, than the city was visited by an earthquake, which the Empress regarding as a judgment on her injustice towards him, entreated Chrysostom to return. But before two months had passed, fresh accusations were brought against him; another council was held, and Chrysostom was condemned for having resumed his See without the sanction of the Church. More than once his life was in danger, and by the Emperor's command he was banished, first to Nice, and then to Cucusus, a small and remote town amongst the mountains of Armenia. There in that desolate spot he was able to exercise even a greater influence than he had done in his own Patriarchate; he was kindly received by the neighbouring Bishops; letters of sympathy reached him from all quarters; Innocent I., Bishop of Rome (402—417), wrote to him as his equal, in commendation of his patience; and Honorius, the Emperor of the West, interceded for him. But the enmity of Eudoxia still pursued him; an even wilder place of exile was fixed upon; but on his way thither, he died near Pontus, on September 14, A.D. 407.

Theophilus dying A.D. 412, was succeeded in the Patriarchate by his nephew, Cyril. On the deposition of St. Chrysostom, Arsacius, a man eighty years of age, and brother of the late Bishop Nectarius, was appointed to succeed him in the See of

Constantinople. He dying within a year was succeeded by Atticus, after whom followed Sisinnius, and then Nestorius; a name soon to become memorable in the annals of the Church.

The name of St. Jerome (circ. 331—420), whom Erasmus styled the chief of the Latin Fathers, and who in his influence on the Church was second only to St. Augustine, whilst he was intellectually his superior, is particularly connected with two events, the propagation of Monasticism in the West, and his translation of the Bible.

Born, of Christian and opulent parents, at Stridon, near Aquileia, Eusebius Hieronymus, or Jerome, was sent early in life to Rome, where he studied Greek philosophy, and laid the foundation of that learning for which he was afterwards conspicuous, which fitted him for the undertaking of his great work, the translation of the Scriptures into Latin. "The *Vulgate*," says Dean Milman in his *Latin Christianity*, "was a wonderful work; it almost created a new language, and was, perhaps more than the Papal power, the foundation of Latin Christianity." But St. Jerome is not a man whom we can admire; his character is well summed up by Canon Robertson in his *History of the Christian Church*, as containing, with extraordinary intellectual gifts and sincere love of Christ, love of power, vanity, extreme irritability, and bitterness of temper.

Having been baptized at Rome, after he reached manhood, by Pope Liberius, a vehement thirst after learning led him to travel through various parts of Europe, during which he studied the heathen authors with such avidity that he sometimes forgot to eat or drink. Whilst engaged on such studies, especially Cicero and Plautus, at a time when he was suffering under severe illness, the Saviour appeared to him in a dream, and on Jerome's asserting that he was a Christian, told him, "Thou liest, thou art a Ciceronian, not a Christian, for where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also." The monastic system had lately been introduced into Italy by St. Athanasius, and Jerome having

become acquainted in his travels with several monasteries, determined to renounce his classical and philosophical pursuits, and withdrew (A.D. 374) to the anchorites in the wilderness of the Thebaid. There, as a means of fortifying himself against sinful thoughts, he occupied his mind in studying Hebrew from a converted Jew; a task of the greatest consequence to the Church, as it enabled him to read the Old Testament in the original language. At the same time, in order to mortify the sensual temptations to which he had yielded before his Baptism, he subjected his body to such severe ascetic discipline, that his health broke down, and being obliged to abandon for a time his ascetic life, he retired to Antioch.

At Antioch he was (A.D. 378) ordained by Paulinus, Bishop of the See, and went thence to Constantinople, where he was much impressed by the sermons which St. Gregory Nazianzen was then preaching in the city. He next went to Rome, where he settled down, A.D. 382, as Secretary to Pope Damasus, by whose advice he set about his translations of the Bible.

At Rome, where he found universal luxury prevailing, he became the spiritual adviser and general confessor of several ladies of high condition, over whom he exerted a paramount influence, striving to induce them to adopt celibacy as the brides of Christ, and to adopt a life of strict asceticism. Amongst his staunchest followers were Paula, a widow belonging to an aristocratic family, and her daughters Blesilla and Eustochium. Blesilla died early in consequence of the severity of the asceticism to which she subjected herself. But this conduct laid him open to misrepresentation, and brought upon him many odious and false accusations from the relatives of his followers; nor were these confined to the laity, the Clergy also, whose shortcomings and ignorance and vices he exposed, taking part against him. Pope Damasus died A.D. 384; Jerome had at one time flattered himself that his popularity was such that he might have been chosen as his successor.

Whether true or not, he was, fortunately for all parties, passed over, and Siricius (384—398) elected.

In the year following the death of Damasus, Jerome, smarting under the treatment which he had received, left Rome, travelling sometimes in company of Paula and Eustochium, for the East, visiting the monastic establishments of Egypt, and the Holy places of Palestine. In 386 he took up his permanent abode in a cell at Bethlehem, where through the sale of his patrimony he was enabled to build a hospice for pilgrims who visited Rome, and a monastery over which he himself presided ; whilst Paula built three convents for women, of which she herself became Superior. At Bethlehem, Jerome completed the Vulgate translation of the Bible which he had commenced at Rome. At Rome he had corrected the Latin Versions of the New Testament. He now corrected the Latin Versions of the old Testament from the Septuagint, or Greek Version, and then made a direct translation from the original Hebrew.

The value of the work cannot be overrated, and the Vulgate of Jerome gained universal acceptance, as the authorised translation of the Bible, in all the Western Churches, till the Reformation, and still continues to be that of the Roman Church. Yet, at the time, like almost every event of his life, it led to misrepresentation and caused him enemies. Even the great St. Augustine tried to dissuade him from the task ; but the success which attended it is the best answer to objections.

Paula died at Bethlehem, A.D. 404, and was buried with a magnificent ceremony in the Church of the Nativity. Eustochium died A.D. 419 ; and, on September 30, A.D. 420, Jerome, at the age of eighty-nine, followed them to the grave, and his tomb is still shown in the narrow cell at Bethlehem where he lived and taught and died.

St. Augustine (354—430), the greatest of the Latin Fathers, who, more than any Christian writer since the Apostles, has influenced the succeeding generations of Christianity, was born on No-

vember 13, A.D. 354, at Tagasta, a small village in Numidia, not far from Hippo, the seat of his future Bishopric. His father Patricius was at the time a heathen, and a man of indifferent character, but his mother Monica was a pious and earnest Catholic. The account of his early life is gathered from his own *Confessions*.

His religious education was carefully superintended by his mother, under whom he received his first religious impressions. He became a Catechumen; and whilst suffering under a dangerous illness was on the point of being baptized, but on his recovery his Baptism was, in accordance to the mistaken principle of the time, deferred. His father sent him first to a small school in his native village, and then to one at Madaura, and afterwards he went to the famous school in the dissolute city of Carthage. There, whilst he took pleasure in study, and held the first place in the school of Rhetoric, he fell into bad company and vicious habits, and had a natural son, on whom the particularly inappropriate name, Adeodatus (given by God), was bestowed. Greek and Greek literature he disliked, and was obliged to study them through the medium of a translation.

His father having been induced by Monica to receive Baptism, died when Augustine was seventeen years of age, leaving his family in straitened circumstances. Augustine resolved not to enrol himself under the banner of any particular party, but to seek truth wherever it might be found. He grew weary of reading the books of heathen philosophy, because in them the name of Christ, which he had been taught by his mother, was not found. He then read the New Testament, but found no pleasure in the simplicity of its teaching. So, when he was twenty years of age, he alighted on Manichæism, a system which professed to combine the dualism of the Gnostics with the teaching of the Gospel. Such a rationalistic system satisfied his intellectual vanity for eight years. His mother meanwhile, who was grievously hurt with his continued dissolute habits and Manichæan errors, and

constantly followed him with her prayers, received much consolation from an aged Bishop, who told her that he himself had once been a Manichæan, and bade her be of good cheer, for that the child of so many tears could not be a castaway.

Augustine, still holding the Manichæan heresy, went, A.D. 383, to Rome, where he opened a school; but not finding the means of supporting himself, he succeeded in obtaining, through Symmachus the Prefect of Rome, the office of teacher of Rhetoric at Milan, where he was received with much kindness by Bishop Ambrose. Augustine went at first to hear him out of curiosity, but his heart was by degrees, and almost insensibly to himself, touched by the teaching of the great preacher. When Monica joined him at Milan she had the happiness of finding that he had discarded the Manichæan errors.

Filled with grief and shame for his past life, he betook himself to the study of the Scriptures. He was much interested in what he learnt about the self-denial of St. Anthony and the Monks, and how the former had been led by the story of the rich young man in the Gospel, to sell all that he had and give to the poor. Though he had discarded Manichæism, he still had his doubts about Christianity. He had at one time thought lightly of St. Paul's Epistles. But in his difficulties he now determined to consult Simplician, a holy Priest at Milan. He told him of his having read some work of Plato which had been translated into Latin by Victorinus, who had been a Pagan Professor of Rhetoric at Rome, but had died a Christian. Simplicius informed him that he himself had been instrumental in his conversion. Augustine took the Bible and opened it at St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and his eyes fell on the words, "Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof."

The words of St. Paul completed what St. Ambrose had begun.

Augustine saw there the hideous picture of his own life, and all his former hesitation was removed. He at once communicated the grateful intelligence to Monica. He threw up his office of Professor, and again became a Catechumen, placing himself under the direction of St. Ambrose, by whom he in his thirty-third year, together with his son Adeodatus, were baptized in Milan Cathedral, on Easter-Eve, A.D. 387.

He then determined to return to Africa, but had only reached Ostia, where he intended to embark, when Monica died in her fifty-sixth year. From Ostia he proceeded to Rome, where he wrote two books against the Manichæans; and after staying there several months, left for Carthage, where he landed about September, A.D. 388. He then gave himself to study and devotion for three years at Tagasta. At the request of a friend who wished to receive from him instruction, he went to Hippo, of which place Valerius was Bishop; and notwithstanding his objections, was ordained by Valerius A.D. 391. In 395 he was consecrated assistant Bishop by Valerius, on whose death, which happened shortly afterwards, Augustine himself became Bishop of that obscure and comparatively unimportant See, where he spent the remaining thirty-four years of his life.

Here he founded a Convent for Nuns, as also a College of Priests, the latter sharing with him his episcopal residence, without, however, losing their *secular* character. Whilst he was indefatigable in preaching and in the duties of his diocese, he was much occupied in controversies with heretics, more especially with the Donatists, of whom we have heard already, and the Pelagians, the latter of whom rejected the doctrine of original sin and asserted the absolute freedom of the human will. He lived to hear of the sacking of Rome by Alaric (of which mention will be made in the next chapter), and it was this event that called forth his great work *De Civitate Dei*, which employed him for thirteen years (413—426). The Pagans complained that the calamities which beset the Empire were due to Christianity.

Augustine shows that they were due to the vices and corruptions of Paganism, and the luxury and effeminacy of the people ; that the earthly city, with its false gods and heathen sacrifices, had passed away, and was superseded by the City of God, the Church of Christ, which should last for ever.

He lived to witness a nearer calamity, when the devastating army of the Vandal Genseric subjected Hippo to a fourteen months' siege ; but on August 28, A.D. 430, he was released by death from witnessing the capture and burning of his cathedral city. He left neither lands nor money, his valuable library, which was saved from the siege, being his only possession, and that he left to the Church.

CHAPTER VI.

THE WANDERING OF THE NATIONS.

DEGENERATE State of the Roman Empire—The Emperors Honorius and Arcadius—The abolition of the gladiatorial games—Three Sieges of Rome by Alaric—A mock-Emperor set up—Fall of Rome—Effect of Christianity upon the Arian Conquerors—The Emperor Theodosius II., Emperor of the East, and his sister Pulcheria—Settlements of the Teutonic conquerors in the Roman Provinces—Valentinian III., Emperor of the West—The Catholic Faith unaltered by the Germans—The British Church—Infected with Pelagianism—St. German and Lupus, and Severus—The Council of Ephesus—The heresy of Nestorius—St. Cyril of Alexandria—His enmity against St. Chrysostom—Hypatia—Pope Celestine I.—John, Patriarch of Antioch—Banishment of Nestorius—Pope Leo I.—Increased pretensions of the Papacy—St. Hilary of Arles—The Eutychian Heresy—The Tome of Leo—The Latrocinians—Marcian and Pulcheria. The Council of Chalcedon—See of Jerusalem raised to a Patriarchate—Privileges given to the Patriarchate of Constantinople—Attila—Battle of Chalons—Foundation of Venice—Sack of Rome by the Vandals—Fall of the Western Empire—Italy transferred to the Ostrogoths—Theodoric, King of Italy—The German Conquerors of Britain—The Alleluia Victory—The Britons call in the Germans against the Picts and Scots—The Conquest of Britain—The Germans found Kingdoms in Britain—Difference in the Conquest of Britain from the other German Conquests—The Welsh—Preaching of the Gospel in Ireland—In Scotland—Iona—Church of Wales—The Welsh take no steps to convert the English.

WE are now approaching the time when the great movement, which the Germans call *Völkerwanderung* (*Wandering of the Nations*), brought our forefathers to the land, which, before called Britain, took from one of their tribes the name of England. The Conquest of Rome and the settlement of its Teutonic conquerors on the ruins of the Roman Empire, belong primarily to secular history; but to the Church of England they are matters of special interest, inasmuch as a race was coming to the front, destined to be the leading race of the world; destined also, not only to conquer the country, but also to overthrow the Church, of Britain, and themselves to remain for about a

hundred and fifty years after the commencement of their conquest, in a state of heathendom.

The Roman Empire had long been tottering to its fall. Luxury and vice had undermined the foundations of society, and lowered the national character. Amongst the Emperors there had been many whom their vices alone rescued from oblivion. The division of the Empire between two or three, and even more, Emperors, and the removal of the seat of government from Rome, had lowered the prestige of the Capital, and political decay and disaster was the inevitable result. The military spirit had degenerated; Goths were appointed to the highest commands in the army; power had fallen into the hands of Germans, whom the Romans despised as *barbarians*, but who were soon to become the conquerors of the Empire. Never was the apothegm, that familiarity breeds contempt, more clearly illustrated, than in this connexion between Goths and Romans. The former acquired a knowledge of Roman culture, but with it also a knowledge of Roman degeneracy. They lost the awe which the name of Rome had once inspired, and only awaited the opportunity of succeeding to its greatness, and settling themselves down on the Provinces of the Roman Empire.

For two centuries the barbarous hordes of Germany—Goths, Vandals, Franks, Burgundians, Lombards, one tribe pressed forward by another on its rear, had been drawing nearer and nearer to Rome. We have seen how the Goths, impelled onward by the Huns, had crossed the Danube and received from the Emperor Valens a grudging settlement in Roman territory, and how Valens was defeated and slain by them at the battle of Hadrianople (A.D. 378). After this the Goths were never again driven out, whilst many of them took service in the Roman army. The powerful Emperor Theodosius was able to keep them in check; but after his death and the division of the Empire between his two weak and imbecile sons, Honorius

(395—423), a boy eleven years, and his elder brother Arcadius (395—408), eighteen years of age, the invaders could no longer be kept off, and the fall of the Empire was inevitable.

The two young Emperors possessed virtues which might have adorned a private station, where statesmanship and warlike qualities were not required, but were wholly unfitted for grappling with the difficulties which beset the Empire. Theodosius' dying counsel to his sons was to remember that true religion was the safeguard of the Empire. In the matter of religion, they followed the example set them by their father, practising even greater severity in extirpating whatever of Paganism survived his death. All images of Pagan worship were ordered to be destroyed, all Pagan festivals abolished; the Bishops were entrusted with the duty of seeing that the edict was properly carried out, and the civil magistrates were to assist them in the task. Another edict, excluding all but the orthodox from serving in the army, and from holding public offices, was afterwards repealed.

Many humane laws followed on this advance of Christianity. One such law directed the magistrates to periodically visit the prisons, and to enquire into the condition of the prisoners. Another, which originated with Honorius in the West, ordered the abolition of the inhuman gladiatorial shows, against which the Christian Church had long protested in vain, and which, though forbidden by the first Christian Emperor, had still continued to exist. The story is told, how Telemachus, an Asiatic monk, hearing that the games were about to take place, travelled (A.D. 404) the whole way from the East to Rome, and proceeding to the amphitheatre, threw himself on to the arena between the contending gladiators. The spectators being maddened with this interference in their favourite amusement, the monk paid the penalty of his heroism with his life. No sooner, however, was the murder effected than they repented of their cruelty; the Emperor Honorius, who was himself present, acknowledged that

his noble conduct conferred on the monk the honour of martyrdom; and a law was passed, to which the Romans assented without a murmur, abolishing for ever the cruel sacrifices of the amphitheatre.

The name of Alaric, King of the Visigoths, stands pre-eminent amongst the barbarian chieftains of the time, and to him attaches the honour of being the first conqueror, since Hannibal, who appeared before the gates of Rome. Having in vain offered his services to both the Emperors, he announced and executed his intention of invading the Roman territories. The Emperor Honorius had been educated in the universal belief that no power on earth could be presumptuous enough to attempt the overthrow of the greatest Empire which the world had ever known. Nearly one hundred years before, Lactantius had given expression to what every one believed, that when Rome, "the head of the world, should fall, without doubt the end of all things, even of the world itself, would arrive." The Emperor's belief was rudely shaken by the appearance (A.D. 403) of Alaric before the Palace of Milan, where he was then residing; and (A.D. 404) the cowardly Emperor, thinking little of anything beyond his own safety, having fortunately just before accomplished the only noble work of his life, the abolition of the gladiatorial combats, took refuge in Ravenna, which thenceforward for three hundred years became the capital of Italy.

For a time Alaric was kept at bay by the Roman General Stilicho, who was, like himself, a Vandal of German blood, and of equal military ability. But, on August 23, A.D. 408, Honorius, actuated, it was supposed, by jealousy, did him to death on a vague charge of treason. Rome had now no General capable of defending it against the advancing Goths, and thenceforward Alaric had all his own way. In October he appeared under the walls of Rome.

The first feeling of the Roman nobles and people was one of contempt and indignation, that a low barbarian should presume

to attack the great capital of the world. The feeling, however, was soon humbled by the combined horrors of famine and plague, which, first invading the cottages of the poor, soon spread to the palaces of the rich and noble; and they saw that their only hope lay in the clemency of the conqueror. They deputed two ambassadors to treat with him, who in loftier style than their abject condition warranted, threatened him with the danger which would arise from their innumerable population, well exercised also in arms, if driven by hard conditions to despair. "The thicker the harvest, the easier mown," replied Alaric. He then fixed an enormous tribute which he demanded as a ransom. "What then, O King, do you leave us?" "Your lives," was the haughty reply. Alaric received the ransom, and left Rome.

In 409 he again appeared before Rome. Having first gained possession of the Episcopal city of Ostia, the port and granary of Rome, he summoned it to surrender. The Senate, under fear of famine which was staring them in the face, submitted, and Alaric entered Rome. Whilst the Christian Emperor was enjoying his security in the lagunes of Ravenna, which, like Venice, was built on piles, Alaric completed the ignominy of Rome by setting up as Emperor the Pagan Prefect Attalus; and even him the Senate and people of Rome were willing to acknowledge in place of the unworthy Honorius. Thus Rome appeared in danger of again relapsing into Paganism. The first days of the mock-Emperor Attalus seemed fair and promising; he professed himself willing to extend his clemency to Honorius, on condition of his resigning the purple, in which case he would allow him to reside in exile on some remote island. Attalus, however, soon contrived to fall into disgrace, and was publicly stripped of his Imperial robes by Alaric, who sent them, with the other ensigns of royalty, to Honorius, as a pledge of friendship. Thus peace was once more restored; Paganism again died out; the Temples were allowed by Alaric to stand; but the

Pagan worshippers abandoned the city, and scattered throughout the Provinces of the Empire became absorbed in the rapidly increasing Christian population. The Christians took possession of the abandoned Temples, and converted them, after Consecration, to their own use. Thus, says Dean Milman, several churches in Rome, besides the Pantheon, still retain their Pagan names; and he instances Sta. Maria sopra Minerva, Sta. Maria in Aventino, San Lorenzo in Matuta, San Stephano in Caccio.

With the return of peace, the memory of Rome's recent defeats, so far from humiliating Honorius, only led him on to treat his victorious adversaries with contumely and insult. For the third time (A.D. 410) Alaric appeared under the walls of the capital. The Senate, seeing no other hope of assistance or escape, prepared themselves for a last and desperate resistance. But at the hour of midnight, a gate of the city was by treachery thrown open, and the inhabitants of Rome awoke to find it occupied by the Goths; thus, says Gibbon, "eleven hundred years after the foundation of Rome, the Imperial city, which had subdued and civilised so considerable a part of mankind, was delivered over to the licentious fury of the tribes of Germany and Scythia."

But the effect of Christianity on the victorious Goths, even in the imperfect form of Arianism, now manifested itself, and Alaric exercised a studied moderation in the use of victory. Though Arians, he and his followers were as hostile to Paganism as the most orthodox of the Emperors had been. He at once announced that he waged war, not with the Apostles, but against the Roman people; whilst he destroyed the Pagan Temples, he protected the worship of the Christians, and ordered his soldiers to respect the lovers of humanity and religion, and the Churches of SS. Peter and Paul. There were no doubt many Christian soldiers in the army of Alaric, as there are people at all times and under all circumstances, undeserving the name they bore; and there were also many thousands in his army, especially Huns, who were altogether strangers to Christianity; by such men, there is

every reason for believing, that for the six days during which the Goths occupied Rome, a dreadful and indiscriminate slaughter, and sufferings worse than death, over which it is best to draw a veil, were inflicted on the helpless and unoffending citizens.

How far such excesses were connived at, it is impossible to say. Many public and private residences were also destroyed in the sad necessity of war. Alaric, though he had given orders that the lives of the unresisting citizens should be spared, at the same time himself allowed and even encouraged his followers to reward themselves with the ample spoils of victory. The houses and palaces of the rich were stripped of their valuable contents, of their gold and silver and splendid furniture ; and many exquisite works of art perished. But the Goths were not the ruthless destroyers which they are sometimes imagined to have been. A Goth, having forced open the house of a Virgin, who had dedicated her life to God, viewed with covetous eyes the gold and silver, and the splendid hoard of massive plate of the richest material, which it contained. " 'These," said she, "are the consecrated vessels belonging to St. Peter ; I am too weak to defend them ; you must be answerable to God." Alaric, when he heard of the theft, ordered the whole to be at once taken to the Church of the Apostle. A numerous procession of Goths, attended by a crowd of the Christian inhabitants of Rome, was to be seen, bearing aloft in their hands to the Basilica of St. Peter the sacred vessels of the Church, their martial shouts accompanied by the music of religious psalmody ; and a multitude of the poor and destitute were allowed to enjoy a peaceable and safe asylum within its sacred precincts.

Arcadius, the Emperor of the East, having died, A.D. 408, was succeeded by his son, Theodosius II. (408—450), a pious but feeble Emperor. Besides Theodosius, Arcadius left three daughters, the eldest of whom, Pulcheria, herself at the time only thirteen years of age, undertook the education of the young Emperor, and during the whole of his long reign exercised a

paramount influence over him. She and her two sisters, who were guided by her, solemnly, in the presence of the Clergy and people, dedicated themselves to a life of virginity, their vow being recorded on a tablet of gold and gems, which they publicly offered in the cathedral of Constantinople. They gathered together a religious sisterhood, and the Imperial Palace was converted into a convent. Pulcheria alone of the grandchildren of Theodosius inherited his talents. At the age of sixteen she received the title of Augusta, and for nearly forty years governed the Eastern Empire, which through her means enjoyed a long period of almost uninterrupted peace and tranquillity.

In 421 the young Emperor, then in his twentieth year, was induced by her to marry Athenais (the daughter of an Athenian philosopher), who was soon led to renounce her Paganism, and to accept Baptism under the name of Eudocia. By her the Emperor became the father of a daughter named Eudoxia. We will carry on the history of Eudocia to the end. She, in pursuance of a vow, proceeded on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, on her return from which she found that she had incurred the jealousy and anger of the Emperor. The causes of this change have been differently interpreted ; certain it is, that she was deprived of her position and of all her honours ; and, smarting under the disgrace of what she declared on her death-bed to have been an undeserved suspicion, she returned to Jerusalem, where she spent the remainder of her life in penitential discipline, ending her days in the sixty-seventh year of her age.

The victorious career of Alaric was cut short by his death, A.D. 410, and his brother-in-law Athaulf, a name which was Latinised into Adolphus, was unanimously elected to succeed him as King of the Visigoths. He had married Placidia, the sister of Arcadius and Honorius, although the marriage with a Goth was at the time considered highly degrading to a Roman Princess.

Encouraged by the success which had attended the arms of Alaric, other German tribes, Burgundians, Franks, Vandals, came over, and with the Goths settled in the Provinces of the Roman Empire, in Gaul, Spain, and Africa. Athaulf was assassinated in the palace of Barcelona in Spain, A.D. 415. Placidia, after having been dragged about as a captive by the murderers of her husband, and suffered much indignity from the usurper of the Visigothic throne, was ransomed by the Romans and returned to Italy. She was then induced by Honorius, much against her will, to contract a second marriage with Constantius, a Roman General, by whom she became the mother of two children, Valentinian and Honoria.

The Emperor Honorius died A.D. 423; and after the Western Empire had been held for two years by a usurper named John, who had been principal secretary of the late Emperor, Valentinian III., the last and worst of the family of the great Theodosius, succeeded as Emperor (425—455), under the guardianship of his mother Placidia. He inherited the faults, without the virtues, of his cousin Theodosius II, and of his uncles Arcadius and Honorius. He scandalised Christianity by his vices and immoral intrigues, and although outwardly a Christian, indulged in the profane arts of magic and divination. In 437 he married his cousin Eudoxia; and though, by her gentle and affectionate disposition, she did all in her power to merit his affection, he paid by his death the penalty of his infidelities; whilst he hurried on the fall of the Western Empire by the murder of Ætius, the greatest Roman General of the day.

In the dismemberment of the Roman Empire, the Church alone had escaped the universal chaos. The German tribes who settled in the Provinces of the Empire had, as has been already said, adopted Arianism; whilst the Catholic faith still continued to be the recognized religion both of the Eastern and Western Empires.

The Church of Britain, owing to its insular and isolated position, had always been one of the independent, or so-called *autocephalous* (αὐτοκέφαλοι) Churches, owing allegiance only to its own Metropolitan. St. Athanasius, as we have seen, writing A.D. 363, reckoned the British Church amongst those Churches which were loyal to the Catholic faith; and St. Jerome, whilst complaining, about A.D. 390, of the wide prevalence of Arianism, (*totus orbis ingemuit et se Arianum esse miratus est*), testified to the Catholicity of the British Church. So that though Gildas and Bede speak of the great prevalence of Arianism amongst the Britons, their testimony, as they lived long afterwards, is not to be compared with that of authors who lived in the time of the events which they relate.

But in the early years of the Fifth Century, the British Church undoubtedly fell into the Pelagian heresy, or the denial of Original sin. As Arianism arose in the East, so Pelagianism had its birth in the West. The heresy is attributed to a Welsh monk, named Morgan, a name meaning *Sea-born*, the Latin form of which was Marigena (*mare*, sea), and the Greek form Pelagius (πέλαγος, sea). Pelagius was known as Brito (the *Briton*), and Jerome calls him the “dog of Albion;” but it does not appear that Britain was its birth-place, or that Pelagius was its author. It seems to have been first taught in Rome at the beginning of the Fifth Century, by Rufinus, a monk of Palestine, who taught that man had full power by nature to perform the Will of God, and had only inherited from Adam the freedom to choose between good and evil.

At the end of the Fourth Century, Pelagius took up his residence in Rome, where he became acquainted with Celestine, who is supposed to have been a Scot, which at that time meant a native of Ireland. In Rome the two friends became indoctrinated in the heresy, which was afterwards called after Pelagius.

The soul of Pelagius, a man of blameless character, was stirred

with indignation at the conduct of many professing Christians who pleaded their weakness as an excuse for leading unchristian lives. In combating their excuses, he himself fell into the opposite error of overrating the power of the human will, and of denying the necessity of Divine Grace.

On the sack of Rome by Alaric, Pelagius and Celestine went into Africa, where they parted ; and Pelagius, hoping to find the East more favourable to his doctrine than Africa, took up his abode in Palestine and probably died about A.D. 418. Thus Italy was the birth-place of Pelagianism ; Gaul caught the infection, and from Gaul it was imported, A.D. 429, into Britain, by Agricola, the son of Severianus, a Gallican Bishop, and in a short interval spread over the whole Empire. SS. Jerome and Augustine refuted the heresy, and it was condemned by several Councils, especially the General Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. Yet Zosimus, Pope of Rome (417—418), the first who claimed to “inherit divine authority equal to St. Peter,” was for a time deceived, and pronounced Pelagius and Celestine free from heresy, even reproving the African Bishops for condemning them. St. Augustine remembering his old life, attributed everything to the Grace of God. To Pelagius this seemed to cut at the root of all personal exertion, and to lead to listlessness in religion. In opposing Pelagius, Augustine laid himself open to the imputation of serious error on the doctrine of Predestination, or “the everlasting purpose of God” in choosing His elect for salvation.

It is against this heresy of Pelagius that the Ninth Article of our Church is directed: “Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk) ; but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is ingendered of the offspring of Adam.”

Fastidius, Bishop of London (the only Bishop of the ancient Britons of whom any doctrinal work is extant), had recently urged that a Christian’s hope should be wholly fixed upon

Christ ; yet, through an overstrained interpretation put on the treatise in which the words occur, he was accused of Pelagianism. The British Bishops, who were generally orthodox, alarmed at the rapid progress of the heresy, yet having, as it would appear, no divine competent to cope with it, applied to the neighbouring Church of Gaul (which had gained great celebrity through its Bishops SS. Hilary and Martin), the Mother-Church, perhaps it may be called, of Britain. The Gallican Bishops, after a Council held at Troyes, sent to Britain two divines of high reputation, German of Auxerre, and Lupus, said to have been a brother of St. Vincent of Lerins. Prosper of Aquitaine, a writer of the Fifth Century, says (and his opinion is of weight, for he was on a mission to the Pope, A.D. 431) that they were sent by Pope Celestine. But, on the other hand, the unbiassed authority of Constantius is of greater weight, inasmuch as he was a Presbyter of Lyons, the friend and biographer of St. German, and was likely to know what was going on in Gaul. He makes no mention of the Pope, but attributes the mission to the Council of the Gallican Church. (*"Synodus numerosa collecta est, omniumque judicio, duo præclara religionis lumina universorum precibus ambiuntur, Germanus et Lupus."*)

After a long and stormy passage, the dangers of which we are told were averted by the prayers of St. German, they landed in Britain, and by their preaching in the churches, and fields and streets, they soon brought conviction home to their hearers, till the Pelagians resolved to hold a Council at Verulamium, the scene of St. Alban's martyrdom. Here the cause of orthodoxy triumphed, and the two divines returned to the Continent, leaving the British Church, as they supposed, firmly settled in the faith.

The victory over Pelagianism was not however yet complete. The heresy revived, and about eighteen years afterwards St. German returned, but on this occasion accompanied by Severus of Treves, a pupil of his former colleague ; his labours

were again successful; but now the heretical teachers were banished, and Pelagianism never afterwards troubled the British Church. From this time, Bede says, the British Church remained sound and orthodox.

The Third General Council, that of Ephesus, met A.D. 431.

In 428 Nestorius^a, first a monk and afterwards a Presbyter at Antioch, a man of some learning, of blameless life, and an eloquent preacher, had been elected Patriarch of Constantinople in succession to Sisinnius. Nestorius, as soon as he was elected, showed himself a violent opponent of the doctrines of the Arians, Macedonians, and Apollinarians^b.

A Presbyter named Anastasius, whom Nestorius had taken with him from Antioch, preached in the Cathedral of Constantinople a sermon, in which he set forth that the Virgin Mary ought not to be called the Mother of God (Θεοτόκος, a title which had been frequently applied to her by the Fathers), on the ground that she was a human being, and that God could not be born of a human mother. He therefore insisted that she ought to be called the Mother of Christ. Nestorius supported his friend, and thinking to avoid the Apollinarian heresy, maintained that there were in Christ two *hypostases* or Natures, one Divine, the Eternal Word, the other Human, the Man Christ. He too objected to the title Theotokos, Mother of God, which seemed to give her a divine character, and claimed for her that of Mother of Christ (Χριστοτόκος), into whom the Divine Person entered. This doctrine seemed to imply that there were in the Saviour Two Persons.

St. Cyril of Alexandria (412—444), who had succeeded his irascible uncle Theophilus^c, in the Patriarchate of that See; a man vying with his uncle in point of temper; now stood forth as the champion of orthodoxy, perhaps not sorry of an opportunity of crushing the Patriarch of the rival See of Constantinople, and advancing his own Patriarchate. He entered the lists

^a See p. 203.

^b See p. 191.

^c See p. 202.

against the present Patriarch, as Theophilus had against his predecessor, St. Chrysostom.

Cyril, who had been trained in the Alexandrian School, afterwards became a hermit in the deserts of Nitria. On the election of his uncle to the See of Alexandria, he was called forth from his solitude to become a preacher in the city, where he, a man of comely appearance and mellifluous voice, acquired great fame by his sermons. The nephew even went beyond the uncle in his enmity of St. Chrysostom ; not only refusing after the death of the latter to join in the reversal of the sentence against him, but branding him as a second Judas. On the death of his uncle he was appointed, after a contest with the Archdeacon Peter, to succeed him in the Patriarchate, with which he combined, with anything but the mildness of a Christian Bishop, the dignity of a civil magistrate.

This brought him into contact with Orestes, the Prefect of the city, a man who bore a high character, and who, regarding the holding of such an office by a Bishop an encroachment on the civil power, became his opponent. Cyril's Episcopate was marked by much love of strife and with avarice, and he was charged with Simony. Like Nestorius he began with persecution, the chief subjects of it in his case being the Novatians, whilst he expelled the Jews from Alexandria. This last act was resented by the Prefect, nor did Cyril meet with the support which he had expected from the people of Alexandria ; and when, in consequence, he sought a reconciliation with Orestes, his advances were rejected. His character also suffered much from the cruel murder of Hypatia.

Hypatia, a Pagan lady of extraordinary beauty, was equally conspicuous for her learning and the blamelessness of her character, so that she was universally respected by the people of Alexandria and by the Prefect. She mixed freely with the Philosophers of the city, herself delivering lectures in philosophy ; and it was thought that Cyril was jealous, because greater num-

bers attended her lectures than his sermons. The only charge which it was possible to lay against her was, that she was a friend of Orestes, the enemy of Cyril. A band of furious zealots, some of them Cyril's followers, headed by a Reader named Peter, attacked her in the streets of Alexandria, and dragging her from her chariot, literally tore her to pieces (A.D. 415). Cyril, although doubtless he was not concerned in the murder, yet, owing to the line of conduct which he had pursued, it was attributed to him, and has left an indelible stain upon his character. He is accounted a Saint of the Church, so we give him his title.

To return to the controversy between him and Nestorius. Both the disputants waxed very angry, and adduced charges and countercharges against each other. Both referred the matter to Pope Celestine I. (422—432). The Pope was no doubt much gratified with the subservient language of Cyril, whose See did not stand on the same footing of equality with Rome, as did that of Constantinople. Celestine became an ardent admirer of Cyril, whom he styled the "defender of the Church and Faith, the Catholic doctor, and an Apostolic man;" and in a Council at Rome condemned Nestorius. He also sent a letter to the Churches of Constantinople and Antioch, announcing his intention of issuing a sentence of excommunication, unless Nestorius should within ten days conform to the faith of Rome and Alexandria. He afterwards issued the sentence, leaving its execution to Cyril. Cyril also, at a Council in his own Patriarchate, drew up twelve anathemas; these, however, the Eastern Bishops, headed by the Patriarch of Antioch, declared to involve the Apollinarian heresy; and Nestorius retorted by twelve anathemas against Cyril.

Thus two Patriarchates, those of Rome and Alexandria, were on one side, two, those of Constantinople and Antioch, on the other. Nestorius, who far from humbling himself to the servile language of Cyril, had addressed the Pope as his equal, now set Celestine's letter at defiance. The Emperor Theodosius,

who also was equally unwilling to allow the Pope's interference with his own Patriarch, summoned the Third General Council, with the view of remedying the troubles and confusion which existed in the Church.

The Council, consisting of over two hundred Bishops, met at Ephesus on Whitsunday. John, the Patriarch of Antioch, on whose assistance Nestorius relied, had not yet arrived, but wrote in a letter to Cyril that he had been delayed by exceptional circumstances, and announced that he would arrive within a few days. Nestorius refused to attend the Council before John's arrival. Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, the Church historian, probably since the death of St. Augustine the leading Theologian of the day, and sixty-seven other Bishops, protested against any unseemly haste. Candidian, who was deputed by the Emperor to watch the proceedings of the Council, also advocated delay. Yet Cyril, determined to wait no longer, on June 22, in virtue of his Patriarchate, assumed the Presidency of the Council. The Council proceeded to business, and several extracts from orthodox writings were produced; but when the words of Nestorius were read, the Bishops stopped their ears against what they considered blasphemy. The heresy of Nestorius was unanimously condemned; he himself being denounced as "the new Judas," and sentenced to deposition.

John of Antioch, who with the Eastern Bishops arrived on June 27, learnt with indignation the hasty proceedings of the Council. They then themselves held another Council, which deposed Cyril, and Memnon Bishop of Ephesus; and forty-three Bishops, amongst whom was Theodoret, signed the sentence of deposition. Cyril retaliated by excommunicating John. The Emperor wrote demanding that the doctrinal question should be more fully examined.

Shortly after the Council of Ephesus, two delegates from the Pope, who had also been delayed on their journey, arrived, and on July 10 held a fresh session in Memnon's house. The sen-

tence pronounced against Nestorius in the previous sessions was confirmed, and he, together with John and his adherents, condemned. A letter was written to the Emperor stating that the whole Church was against Nestorius. Theodosius was perplexed by different statements which were presented to him, but acting under the influence of Pulcheria, who was personally hostile to Nestorius, ultimately confirmed the sentence against him. Nestorius was then deposed, and Maximian, a monk, was in October, 431, consecrated to the Patriarchate. Cyril and Memnon were confirmed in their Sees. Eventually, John of Antioch and Theodoret and their adherents accepted the decrees of the Council, which were generally accepted both by the Eastern and Western Churches, although the doctrines of Nestorius continued to receive a wide and important acceptance in the East. On the death of Maximian, A.D. 434, the people of Constantinople urged the restoration to the See of Nestorius, who since his deposition had withdrawn to a monastery near Antioch. Proclus, however, the titular Bishop of Cyzicus, who was at the time officiating as Priest of St. Sophia, was appointed, and Nestorius sentenced to banishment.

By the Council of Ephesus, the truth, which Nestorius was accused of denying, was confirmed, that our Lord, although He is God and Man, yet is not two, but one Christ.

Soon after the Council, four of the Patriarchates underwent a change of occupants. In 432 Celestine, the Patriarch of Rome, was succeeded by Sixtus III. (432—440), and he by Leo I., the Great (440—461). In the same year, John of Antioch was succeeded by Domnus. Cyril of Alexandria, dying A.D. 444, was succeeded by Dioscorus, a man who before he became a Bishop bore a high reputation, but afterwards exhibited a violent and intolerant, as well as immoral, character. Proclus was, A.D. 447, succeeded in the Patriarchate of Constantinople by Flavian.

The Pontificate of Leo the Great marks a great advance in

the pretensions of Rome, and under him we first meet the full conception of the Papacy of later times. The General Councils carefully forbade Bishops usurping authority beyond their own Dioceses. But the Council of Sardica, A.D. 347, by granting to Julius, Bishop of Rome, the *personal* right of receiving appeals, was construed as giving to Rome rights of which subsequent Bishops of that See were not slow to avail themselves. Innocent I. (401—417), carried his pretensions further than any of his predecessors, and under him we first find the outline of Rome's claim to universal supremacy. In his answer to the Bishops of a Council at Milevum (A.D. 416), which had condemned Pelagius, he asserted that "all ecclesiastical matters throughout the world ought by divine right to be referred to the Apostolic See, that is of St. Peter, the author of its name and honour." He affirmed that there was no Church in Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, or the adjacent Islands, which was not founded either by St. Peter or his successors. And he appointed Rufus, Archbishop of Thessalonica, to represent him as his Vicar in Illyria; (the first mention to be found of a Vicar Apostolic).

And yet his successor Zosimus (the same who was deceived by the Pelagian heresy) went a step further, and was the first Pope to declare that the Popes inherited a divine authority equal to that of St. Peter, and that no person can question the Pope's decision. When (A.D. 418), Apiarius, an African Presbyter, who had been degraded and excommunicated for misconduct, appealed to Rome, the African Bishops denied the Pope's right to receive the appeal. Zosimus assured them that it had been granted to Rome by the great Council of Nice. Thereupon the Bishops wrote to the Eastern Patriarchs for a copy of the Nicene Canons, and found that the Canon was not one of the Nicene Council, but of a comparatively insignificant Council, that of Sardica, the Council above referred to.

Leo, however, went another step further in the way of progress. St. Hilary, who A.D. 429, when he was only twenty-eight

years of age, had been consecrated to the See of Arles in succession to his relative St. Honoratus, had at a synod held A.D. 444, deposed one of his own suffragans, Celidonius, Bishop of Vienne. Celidonius appealed to Pope Leo, and the Pope, notwithstanding Hilary's protest, entertained the appeal. He affirmed that his right to do so was derived from the Apostles, and that the Apostolic See always had received appeals from Gaul; and he not only re-instated Celidonius, but also transferred the Metropolitan dignity in Gaul from Arles to Vienne.

All the principal Sees were now held by opponents of the doctrines of Nestorius, to which also the monks were opposed. But heresy begets heresy, and heretical opinions were now discovered in the teaching of Eutyches, Archimandrite or Abbot of a monastery near Constantinople. Eutyches, a man seventy years of age, and of blameless life, who had been a strong opponent of Nestorius, in his anti-Nestorian zeal fell into an opposite error with regard to the Humanity of the Saviour. The characteristic tenet of the Eutychian, or, as it was called, the Monophysite (*μονὴ φύσις*, one nature) heresy, was that in Christ there was only one Nature. Domnus, Patriarch of Antioch, represented his teaching to Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, accusing Eutyches of Apollinarianism, and of confounding the Saviour's Natures. A Synod was held at Constantinople, A.D. 448; Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylæum, who had before been the opponent of Nestorius, now took a vigorous part against Eutyches, denounced him as a heretic, and demanded an enquiry into his doctrine.

Flavian, who was reluctantly forced into controversy, called another Synod in the same year to Constantinople, by which Eutyches was deposed and excommunicated. Eutyches then appealed to the Patriarchs of Rome, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, requesting, especially, the protection of Leo. It appears that Flavian also wrote to Leo, who, in answer, requested him to

explain why Eutyches had been so severely punished. Leo was afterwards satisfied with the explanation.

Meanwhile Dioscorus, the Patriarch of Alexandria, who espoused the cause of Eutyches and admitted him to Communion, prevailed on the Emperor Theodosius to summon a Council. The Council, attended by ten Metropolitans, and, in all, one hundred and thirty-five Bishops, met in the same Church of St. Mary at Ephesus, as the Third General Council, on August 1, A.D. 449, under the Presidency of Dioscorus. Julius, Bishop of Puteoli, with two other Legates (one of whom was Hilary, to be Leo's successor in the See of Rome) represented Leo, and occupied the next place of honour to the President, the fifth place only being accorded to Flavian. Leo also addressed to Flavian an Epistle known as the *Tome*, clearly setting forth the orthodox doctrine of the One Person of God and Man; the inferiority of the Son to the Father as touching His Manhood, His equality with the Father as touching the Godhead. This, says Professor Bright, is one of the most precious documents of Christian literature, and was afterwards read during Advent in the Italian and Gallican Churches.

The Council was marked with violence from the first, and a military force was commissioned to keep order. Flavian protested against being put on his trial before Dioscorus, and the Bishops in vain endeavoured to dissuade Dioscorus from presiding. Dioscorus refused to allow the Pope's letter to be read, and as he encouraged the ring-leaders with whom his influence prevailed, a riotous scene occurred. Eutyches was pronounced orthodox, and his sentence of deposition annulled. The question was then brought forward whether Flavian and Eusebius ought not to suffer the punishment which they had pronounced upon Eutyches. Dioscorus, on the ground that Flavian by his dealings with Eutyches had tampered with the Nicene Faith, gave judgment for their deposition. "I disclaim

you," said Flavian. The Bishops, many of whom had during the tumult tried to conceal themselves in obscure parts of the church, were dragged forth and forced by threats and blows to sign the condemnation of Flavian.

The riotous proceedings which followed may be shortly dismissed. Flavian, who was brutally kicked, knocked down, and trampled upon, was by a decree of the Council, sentenced to banishment to Epipas, a village of Lydia; but on his way thither, died of the injuries which he had received, on August 11. Eusebius managed to effect his escape to Rome.

Anatolius was appointed to succeed Flavian in the See of Constantinople. Domnus, Patriarch of Antioch, retired into a monastery. Hilary, one of the Pope's representatives, had met the decision of the Council with such unflinching opposition to the Eutychians, as to render his longer continuance at Ephesus dangerous, so getting away the best way he could, he returned by clandestine and circuitous routes to Rome.

Such was the Latrocinium or robber-council (*σύνοδος ληστροικός*); Leo said in a letter that it was "no Court of justice at all, but a gang of robbers;" hence the name which has always been applied to it.

In a Council held at Rome on October 15, several letters were drawn up. One to the Emperor Theodosius stated that Flavian had appealed to Rome, and requested that a General Council might be summoned, in order that the decisions of the Latrocinium might be annulled. It proposed that *in accordance with the Nicene Council*, it should be held in Italy. This was a slip of the pen, a *pious fraud* on the part of the Pope, similar to that which had been used by Pope Zosimus; it was not a Canon of Nice at all. The Emperor Valentinian, who was in Rome at the commencement of 450, seconded the request in a letter to Theodosius. Theodosius, however, who did not view the matter in the same light, refused his consent, at the same time confirming by an edict the decrees of the late

Council. A letter to Pulcheria, however, excited her sympathy with the cause of orthodoxy.

Theodosius, owing to a fall from his horse, died on July 19, A.D. 450, in the fiftieth year of his age and the forty-third of his reign. On his death the Romans, for the first time, submitted to the rule of an Empress. Pulcheria succeeded her brother in the Eastern Empire; but mindful of the prejudice which would attach to her sex, took, as a nominal husband, Marcian, a Roman Senator, a man sixty years of age, who was like herself a Catholic; he was accordingly invested in the insignia and rank of Emperor, and reigned (450—457) in the East, as the husband of Pulcheria. By a former marriage Marcian had a daughter who married Anthemius, afterwards Emperor of the West (467—472).

By the death of Theodosius the objection to a Council was removed. Pulcheria was opposed to Eutyches, and Marcian acceded to the Pope's request, but not to the meeting of the Council at Rome.

In obedience to the summons of the Emperor, five hundred and twenty Bishops met at first at Nice, on September 1, A.D. 451. The Emperor, however, being occupied by important affairs of State, desired them to proceed to Chalcedon, where, that place being on the opposite shore of the Bosphorus from Constantinople, he could more easily attend the Council. The Fourth General Council accordingly met at Chalcedon on October 8. The Roman Legates for the first time presided at a General Council; next to them sat the Patriarch Anatolius, then came Dioscorus. The first session was marked by riots as disgraceful as those of the Latrocinium. There were in all sixteen sessions, in the third of which Dioscorus was condemned and deprived of his dignity and Orders; the Bishops separated on November 1. The decrees of the Latrocinium were annulled. The condemnation of Dioscorus was confirmed by Marcian, and he was deprived and banished to Gangra, Proterius succeeding him in the See of

Alexandria. Dioscorus died A.D. 454. The *Tome* of Pope Leo was accepted by the Council as a Rule of faith, and the orthodox view, as expressed in the Athanasian Creed, was established, that "our Lord is One, not by conversion of the Godhead into Flesh, but by taking of the Manhood into God. One altogether, not by confusion of Substance but by unity of Person; for as the Reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one Christ."

The Council of Chalcedon confirmed the Creed of the Councils of Nice and Constantinople and the decrees of the Council of Ephesus. "We confess," it enacted, "with the Holy Fathers, one and the same Lord, Jesus Christ, and with one accord we announce Him, perfect in the Godhead, perfect in the Manhood, truly God and truly Man, the Self-same, of a Reasonable Soul and Body; co-essential with the Father as touching the Godhead, and co-essential with us as touching the Manhood, in all things like unto us, Sin only excepted; begotten of the Father as touching the Godhead before all ages, but in the last days for us and our salvation, the Self-same, born of Mary, the Virgin Mother of God, as to manhood. One and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, recognised in two Natures without confusion, change, division, or separation, the difference of Natures being in no wise removed by reason of the union, but on the contrary, the property of each Nature preserved and continuing in one Person, and one hypostasis; not as it were parted and divided into two Persons, but one and the same Son, Only-begotten, God the Word, Lord Jesus Christ, even as we have been taught by the Prophets from the beginning and by Christ Himself, and as the Fathers have handed down to us."

By a decree of the Council, on the claim of its Bishop Juvenal, the See of Jerusalem was raised to the dignity of a Patriarchate; but his claim to superiority over the Patriarch of Antioch was rejected.

The twenty-eighth canon, which confirmed the third canon

of the Council of Constantinople is important. It states that the Council gave the same privileges to New Rome as were before given to Old Rome, on account of its being the Imperial city. The Council of Constantinople had "rightly judged that the city which is the seat of the Empire and of a Senate and equal to Old Imperial Rome in other privileges, should be also honoured as she is in Ecclesiastical matters, as being the second and next after her."

To this canon the Papal Legates, and afterwards Pope Leo, objected. In spite of Councils, succeeding Popes of Rome continued to magnify their pretensions over the Patriarchs of Constantinople. Thenceforward there was a perpetual rivalry between the two Patriarchates, the Patriarch of the latter See claiming a higher dignity, as being Bishop of New Rome, whilst the Roman Patriarch relied on his position as Bishop of the ancient See, and from some rights derived from St. Peter's imaginary Episcopate of Rome. Thus were sown the seeds of the rivalry which culminated in the ultimate schism between East and West.

We must now return to the West.

In the middle of the Fifth Century a new enemy to the Roman Empire appeared in the Huns, who ravaged both the Eastern and Western Provinces, under their terrible King Attila, the *scourge of God*. The other Teutonic tribes were, as we have seen, Christians, although under the form of Arianism. But the Huns, who were unmitigated savages, unrestrained by anything worthy of the name of Religion, spread havoc and ruin wherever they went. Having in the last days of Theodosius ravaged the Eastern Empire up to the very walls of Constantinople, and having imposed humiliating terms of peace and exacted an enormous tribute, Attila determined to turn his army against Western Europe. Marching through Germany and Gaul, and subjecting on his road the peaceful inhabitants of both Roman cities and Gothic settlements to an indiscriminate

slaughter, he arrived at Orleans. Here the Bishop Annianus exhorted the citizens to fortitude and resistance, while he himself contrived the arrival of troops to their assistance. Ætius, the ablest of the Roman Generals, and Theodoric (the son of Alaric) of Toulouse, the most powerful of the Gothic Kings, who were at one in the cause of Christianity, were able to combine their forces; and just as the Huns had made a breach in the walls and were rushing into the city, arrived in time to save it.

Attila thus forced to leave Orleans retired to Chalons on the river Marne. In October 451, the great battle of Chalons, in which Romans, Goths and Franks were united against the common enemy, was won by Ætius, though Theodoric was slain by the javelin of an Ostrogothic Chief. Attila was enabled to escape under cover of night, but the further advance of the barbarians into Gaul was stopped, and a great victory for Christianity achieved. But the spirit of Attila was unbroken, and all the bravery and skill of Ætius could not prevent the ravaging hosts of the Huns from passing over to Italy. Aquileia and many cities in the North of Italy fell under the remorseless hand of the conqueror; neither pity nor mercy was shown; and such of the miserable inhabitants as managed to escape the sword, fled from the mainland to the lagunes, and it is to them that Venetia, or Venice, owes its foundation.

Attila marched on towards Rome. The cowardly Valentinian at first thought of abdicating, but yielding to the advice of the Senate, sent a solemn embassy to deprecate the wrath of Attila. The venerable Pope, Leo, risking his life for the good of his country, accompanied the ambassadors, and entered Attila's tent at Mantua; and by his eloquence and majestic appearance succeeded in enlisting his sympathy, and in obtaining peace for Italy, but only on payment of an enormous ransom.

A fact more strange than fiction marks the episode of the narrative. Attila, the Pagan scourge of God, with a figure so debased as to be scarcely human, had before aspired to the

hand of the Emperor's sister Honoria. Stranger still, it is said that the Princess herself had made the first advances. Honoria having been already convicted of a too susceptible heart, had been banished by her mother to the Convent-palace of Pulcheria and her sisters at Constantinople, where she was forced, much against her will, to spend a dozen years of Fasts and Vigils. To escape a life so hateful to her, she offered herself in marriage to Attila, whose person she must have loathed, of whose language she was ignorant, and whose religion she abhorred. Attila, to whom a wife more or less was a matter of indifference, had agreed to accept her as a wife together with a large ransom. But now that his army was worn out by fatigue and exhaustion, he listened to easier terms, and agreed to accept the dowry without the wife. The Empire was saved from further ravages from Attila by his death, A.D. 453.

The last act of the despicable Emperor of the West, Valentinian III., was the murder (A.D. 454) of Ætius, the greatest general, since Stilicho, of the Empire, who, by the defeat of Attila in the battle of Chalons had for a time saved Rome from its impending ruin.

But Ætius did not die unavenged. Two of his followers were instigated by a senator named Maximus, whose chaste and unsuspecting wife Valentinian had treacherously outraged, to avenge the murder of their patron, and by them Valentinian was murdered on March 16 of the same year. Maximus was by the unanimous voice of the Senate and people elected to succeed him.

As the murder of Stilicho had been followed by the sack of Rome under Alaric, so now the murder of Ætius was quickly followed by a second sack of Rome, at the hands of another German tribe, the Vandals, under their King Genseric, the most barbarous of the barbarian Kings, who, with Alaric and Attila, takes his place in the *destruction* of the Roman Empire in the West.

The Vandals, who had previously overrun Spain, passed, A.D. 429, into Africa. There they were joined by a number of Donatists, who eagerly embraced the alliance of Arians as the opportunity of avenging themselves on the Catholics from whom they had unquestionably suffered much persecution. The barbarity of the Vandal invaders of Africa, and the cruelties inflicted on the Catholic Clergy, are mainly attributable to the vengeance of the Christian Donatists. It was during this invasion that the Vandals (as has been already mentioned^d) subjected to a siege, A.D. 430, Hippo, the See of the venerable St. Augustine; Augustine was spared by his death in the same year from witnessing the final catastrophe, but in the following year Hippo fell under their arms.

The reign of Maximus only lasted three months. In that short period, his first wife having died, he forced the reluctant Eudoxia, the widow of Valentinian, whose murder he had encompassed only a few weeks before, to become his wife. Her feelings he further outraged by boasting of the part he had taken in the murder. The indignant Empress, despairing of help from any other quarter, implored the assistance of the Vandals in Africa, and on their approach, Maximus was put to death by his own soldiers, and his body thrown into the Tiber.

The work which Attila had left unfinished, Genseric completed. A few days after the murder of Maximus, Genseric was in the close vicinity of Rome. Again Pope Leo was commissioned to intercede, but he did not meet with the same success from Genseric as from Attila; he was able, however, to mitigate to some extent the slaughter and miseries of war, but not to ward off the sacking of Rome. The city was given over to the rapacity and licentiousness of the conquerors, who for fourteen days, (June 15—29), subjected it to a havoc more unsparing and far more irremediable than that under Alaric. Churches were ransacked; the magnificent ornaments of the

^d p. 209.

Imperial Palace, and gold and silver amounting to several thousand talents; whatever was anywhere found of public or private wealth; inestimable treasures of sacred and profane art, and amongst them the gilded tiles of the Capitol; the golden Table and the golden Candlesticks which Titus had brought from Jerusalem; together with thousands of captives, amongst them the Empress Eudoxia and her two daughters; were carried away in the ships of Genseric to Carthage. Here the Imperial captives were exposed to the extremities of want, even to hunger and thirst. The noble Bishop of Carthage, Deo-gratias, although his own people were suffering under the cruelties of the Vandals, was their only support; selling the golden and silver vessels of the Church, he applied the money derived from the sale, to the redemption of captives and the relief of the sufferers. Two of the churches were converted into hospitals, where the sick and suffering were comfortably lodged and supplied with food and medicines; the aged Bishop himself visiting them by day and night, and ministering to their bodily as well as spiritual necessities.

The days of the Western Empire were now numbered. Marcian, the Emperor of the East, died, A.D. 457, four years after his wife St. Pulcheria, (for she was canonized by the Church), and was succeeded by Leo I. (457—474), who was crowned by the Patriarch Anatolius;—the first instance, says Gibbon, of an Emperor being crowned by a *Priest*.

In the West, from A.D. 455—475, no fewer than nine emperors reigned. In the latter year Romulus Augustus (the latter of which names was derisively exchanged into the diminutive Augustulus), to whom the irony of fate had given the names of the first King and first Emperor of Rome, the son of a Patrician named Orestes, became Emperor. Odoacer, King of the Heruli, a bold barbarian adventurer, gained the allegiance of the army, and Orestes was slain. The helpless Augustulus signified (A.D. 476) his resignation to the Senate, and threw

himself upon the clemency of Odoacer; and, contrary to the custom which ordinarily prevailed, his life was spared.

Pope Leo I. had died A.D. 461, thus being spared from witnessing the fall of the Western Empire, and a barbarian and Arian king set over Italy. He was succeeded in the See of Rome by Hilary (461—468). But it was reserved for Simplicius (468—483) to witness the crowning disaster of the Roman people, and to acknowledge the supremacy of an Arian conqueror.

The Roman Senate wrote to Zeno, the Eastern Emperor (474—491), disclaiming the necessity of a Western Empire, and expressing their desire that for the future there should be only one Emperor, with the seat of the Imperial government at Constantinople, and that he would grant to Odoacer the title of Patrician of Rome. The fall of the Western Empire, and the transfer of the seat of government from Rome to Constantinople, materially affected the relative position between the Patriarchs of those Sees. By an edict of the late Emperor Leo I., the See of Constantinople had assumed the title of "Mother of all the Churches and of the orthodox religion;" a title to which Simplicius, the Pope of Rome, naturally objected. But the prestige of Rome was lowered, and that of Constantinople further aggrandized, by the political supremacy acquired by the latter through its becoming the sole seat of the Imperial government. Still the Roman Patriarchs gained influence in another way. For the ascendancy given to the Patriarchate of Constantinople still further excited the jealousy of those of Alexandria and Antioch, who were glad to support the supremacy of Rome against the object of their jealousy; whilst the Pope readily welcomed their alliance against his rival Patriarch.

Odoacer, the first barbarian Ruler of Italy, took the Teutonic title of King, with his seat of government, not at Rome but Ravenna; where he exercised the same right as had hitherto belonged to the Emperors, of confirming the election of the

Popes. The vanity of Zeno was flattered by his assumption of the lower title of King, and by his own recognition as sole Emperor; Odoacer gave up the ensigns of the Imperial power, which were destined thenceforward to be worn by no Emperor at Rome for three hundred and thirty-four years.

In 489 and 490, Odoacer was defeated in three battles, by Theodoric, the famous chief of a tribe of Ostrogoths, or Eastern Goths, who had left their seats on the Danube to contest the crown of Italy; and by his order Odoacer was, A.D. 493, stabbed at a banquet. Thus the kingdom of Italy was transferred to the Ostrogoths in the person of Theodoric, who, like the Goths in general, was an Arian, and who still retained Ravenna as his capital.

We must now turn to Britain, the conquest of which was in many respects different from the other conquests of the Germans. It took longer, and was more thorough and more fatal in its results. The German tribes who dismembered the Roman Provinces of the Continent were Christians, who had been in some measure softened by Roman civilization. But the conquerors of Britain were Pagans, worshippers of the sun and moon, and many other false gods; and the conquest of Britain was little short of a sheer dispossession of the people who inhabited the conquered parts of the country.

The Romans, when Alaric was at the gates of Rome, needing all their available forces for the defence of the capital, were obliged to withdraw their legions from Britain. But at that very time danger threatened Britain itself from the Picts of the North (as the Caledonians were then called), and the Scots, or inhabitants of Ireland. During the first visit of St. German to Britain^e, the Picts and Scots had united to invade the country. A large number of the British soldiers were still heathen (an incident which, combined with the inability of its Bishops to combat the Pelagian heresy, argues no high state of efficiency in the

^e See p. 221.

British Church). About the middle of Lent, A.D. 430, the two Gallican missionaries, SS. German and Lupus, joined the British camp, and having spent the intermediate time in their instruction, administered to the soldiers on Easter-Eve the Sacrament of Baptism. The British army, many of them still fresh from the "Baptismal laver," advanced to meet their enemy, placing little hope in their own strength, and relying solely on the help of God. The heathen army drew near, confident of victory; German, who had himself in his youth been a soldier, posted the little army in a narrow valley encompassed by hills, since called Maes Garmon, or the Field of German. Thrice German and Lupus shouted out the joyful Alleluia; the British soldiers caught up the word, familiar to them in their Easter rejoicings; the surrounding mountains multiplying the echo, filled the invading hosts with terror; thinking the rocks were falling on them, they cast away their arms, and fled in precipitate disorder, many of them being drowned in their flight. Thus the Alleluia Victory "was gained by faith and clear of bloodshed," the Britons remaining inactive spectators of the victory, without losing a single man.

But the Alleluia victory only delivered Britain for a short time from its enemies. Again the Picts and Scots returned. In their distress the Britons appealed again and again to Rome for help; one such appeal, inscribed the *Groans of the British*, was addressed to Ætius, thrice Consul; but the hands of Ætius were tied nearer home; so the Britons despairing of help from Rome, and acting under the advice of their leader Vortigern, adopted (A.D. 449) the fatal policy of calling to their aid the assistance of the Germans, who had long been coasting around their shores, and were noted pirates.

This, says Bede, was a punishment sent from God for the wickedness of the people; and Gildas speaks of their infatuation, in calling in a nation to their help whom they dreaded worse than death. These Germans, called by the Romans Saxons,

but known amongst themselves under the common name of Angles or English, were not unacquainted with Britain; they knew well the fertility of its land, the wealth of its cities, the accessibility of its coasts, and the weakness of its people. Nor were the Britons ignorant of the Germans. The Germans not unfrequently had joined their enemies, the Picts and Scots, in their invasions of the country. So frequent and so successful had been their ravages on Britain that the whole shore from the Elbe to the British Channel was known as the Saxon shore, and the Romans had been obliged to appoint an officer, under the title of *Count of the Saxon Shore*, to guard their possessions.

The English were mere obscure tribes in Germany, at the time when the name of the Goths was a terror to Europe. They saw that the opposite coast of Gaul was occupied by another tribe of Germans, and that there was no opening for them there; so, under the garb of friendship, and led by the brothers Hengist and Horsa, they accepted the offer of the Britons, and obtained an easy victory over the Picts and Scots.

But if they could so easily defeat these formidable enemies, they understood how easy also would be the victory over the feeble Britons, and what a rich and pleasant land Britain would be in which to effect a settlement with their wives and children. They soon managed to pick a quarrel with the British, and now joined the Picts and Scots against their former allies. But they met with a stubborn resistance. The Britons found an able leader in Ambrosius Aurelianus, a Briton of Roman descent, who, after the death of the feeble Vortigern and his son Vortimer, was invested with the command of the British forces. The name of King Arthur has left a mark on our national traditions, but is so mixed up with fable as even to throw a doubt on his very existence. It seems, however certain, that, A.D. 520 (and it is said under his command), the Britons gained an important victory at Mount Badon, near Bath.

They could not, however, permanently dislodge their enemy from the positions which they gained. By degrees other adventurers from Germany came over and gained possession of all the country except the mountainous districts of the West. First had come the Jutes, who set up the kingdom of Kent, A.D. 451, under their King Hengist (for his brother Horsa had been killed in battle), with his seat at Canterbury. Next came the Saxons, who founded the kingdom of Sussex, or of the South Saxons, including Surrey, A.D. 477; and Essex, or the country of the East Saxons, and Middlesex, of the Middle Saxons, with the chief town of London, A.D. 530. Later came the Angles, A.D. 547, who founded the kingdom of Northumbria, the country north of the Humber, as far as the Clyde, with its two divisions of Bernicia and Deira; and East Anglia, with its two divisions of Norfolk (North Folk) and Suffolk (South Folk), and Cambridgeshire. Others went inland, and founded Mercia, or March-land, A.D. 548.

These German tribes are commonly spoken of under the names of Saxons, Anglo-Saxons, or English; but as it is this last name under which they were known amongst themselves, and are known in the present day, we shall continue to call them under the name of English.

The conquest of Britain by our forefathers, the founders of the English people, was thus effected, and never was victory more complete or so cruelly used. Of all the barbarous hordes which dismembered the Roman Empire, the English were the most barbarous. Whole villages and towns were consigned to the flames, and a promiscuous slaughter of the inhabitants ensued; and many of those whom the sword and fire spared, famine and pestilence destroyed. The conquest of Gaul, and Spain and Italy was little more than a forcible settlement of the conquerors in the conquered country, which was destined in course of time to absorb the conqueror. Gaul, which, like Britain, was inhabited by Celts, was allowed to preserve its

institutions and religion, and the conquerors learnt in time to speak the Latin language. French is not the language of the Franks, but the old Latin language, or rather the Roman dialect derived from the Latin, of the Gauls, whom the Franks conquered.

The Pagan conquerors of Britain determined to destroy Christianity off the face of the land, and Britain was the only country which was accompanied by the practical abolition of its faith. The churches and numerous monasteries in the land were destroyed; Bishops and Clergy were either slain or found safety in flight; some of the people threw themselves on the mercy and became the slaves of the conquerors; others fled to Armorica, where they settled down and gave the country the name of Britany; the religion, and laws, and language of the people were all changed; and the very days of the week took the names of the Pagan deities.

Who and what the gods of our forefathers were, we may learn from the days of the week. They worshipped the Sun from whom we have Sunday, and the Moon from whom we have Monday, and the terrible god Tew who gave his name to Tuesday. Their great god was Woden, then Thor, the thunderer, and Freia, the goddess of plenty, from whom Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, are derived; whilst an obscure deity, Sætere, gives the name to Saturday.

The Welsh, or *strangers*, as the English called the Britons, had made a successful resistance, and still retained a considerable part of Britain. Strathclyde, or Cumberland, including the country from the Clyde to the Mersey; Cambria, or North Wales, (the country which is now called Wales); South Wales, or Devon and Cornwall, remained purely British. The Welsh to the present day continue to speak their old Celtic language; entirely different from the English which is derived from the conquerors of Britain; differing also from the Romance, or Latin dialect, for the reason that Britain being a remote Pro-

vince of the Empire was never thoroughly Romanised, and so preserved a different dialect from that of Spain or Gaul.

Thus Britain became divided into two parts, the conquered and the unconquered parts, the former taking the name and speaking the language of the conquerors, the latter preserving its Welsh name and Celtic language. But the one old Church remained on, with an unbroken succession, with the same three Orders of the ministry and the same sacraments; as the Christians during the siege of Jerusalem took refuge in Pella, so now the Christians of the conquered part found a refuge amongst their kinsfolk in Wales. Paganism in its attempt to exterminate Christianity, would naturally seek out the Bishops. Prelates, says Gildas, were destroyed, together with the people, by fire and sword, and no man dare give them burial; for a time, we are told, Theon, Bishop of London, and Thadioc of York continued to hold their Sees; but when this was no longer safe, they also, A.D. 587, took refuge amongst their brethren of Wales.

Episcopacy in England was, no doubt, in abeyance, but Christianity could not have been thoroughly exterminated. When the missionaries sent by St. Gregory, Bishop of Rome, arrived in England (and this was only ten years after the last Bishops had left the country) there were churches in Kent, two at Canterbury, St. Martin's, and the original edifice of Christ Church (although the latter may have been in ruins); there were old Roman churches in Dover Castle, Reculver, and Lyminge; and if there were churches in Kent, which was particularly exposed to the ravages of the invaders, it is a fair presumption that other churches existed in other parts of the country.

"The common belief," says Bishop Pearson, a former learned Bishop of Chester, "that the Celtic population of Britain was exterminated and driven into Wales and Britany has absolutely no foundation in history. . . . We know that a race of Romanized Britons, whom they called Leogrians, took part in the invasion of their Celtic kinsmen, and we cannot suppose that the Saxons

would have cut the throats of their allies after the war." In support of this opinion may be taken the fact that the conquerors would have to seek their wives from the conquered nation, and would thus be brought under the gentle influence of Christianity. And it is to be remarked that the few Celtic words which the English language still retains are those of domestic use ; such as (to quote them from Mr. Symes) basket, button, darn, garter, gown, gruel, hem, mop, pail, pan, pitcher, which denote an influence of the Britons in the family life of their English conquerors.

In Wales (the British Pella, as we have called it) there was a flourishing Church at this time. The See of Caerleon-on-Usk, which seems to have been the first See in the country, was afterwards broken up into six Bishoprics ; and at the end of the Sixth Century there were the same four which exist in the present day. There were famous schools, one of which was founded by St. Dubricius, or Dyfrig, the first Bishop of Llandaff, amongst whose thousand pupils were St. Teilo, who succeeded him in his See, and St. Samson, Bishop of Dol, in Britany. There was the school in Glamorganshire founded by St. Iltutus (a kinsman of King Arthur), called after him Llanyltad, and afterwards Llanwit Major, at which many illustrious pupils, and amongst them St. Gildas, were educated. There was the White House, or White-land, in Glamorganshire, in which St. David was a pupil.

There were also several religious communities known under the common name of Ben-chor or Bangor (beautiful choir), where Daniel or Deiniel Wyn founded the See and became the first Bishop. Another, now called St. Asaph, was founded by St. Mungo, on the banks of the river Elwy, which name it first took, deriving its present name from Asaph, the second holder of the See. And most famous of all was Bangor Iscoed, which is said to have contained two thousand one hundred monks.

There were also famous saints, one of whom was St. David or Dewi, the Patron Saint of Wales, said to have been the son of a Prince, and to have been Bishop of Caerleon, which See he

removed to Menevia, afterwards called after him St. David's. Under him also two Synods were held, one at Llandewi-Brefi, near Lampeter, and another at a place which bears the Latin title of *Lucus Victoriæ*.

There is therefore much reason for believing that the account of Gildas of the corrupt state of the Church in Wales at this time is exaggerated. But there was one deserved charge which both Gildas and Bede bring against them, viz., that "they never preached the faith to the Saxons or English who dwelt amongst them." The conversion of the English people must therefore proceed from other sources.

CHAPTER VII.

GROWING TENSION BETWEEN EAST AND WEST.

CONTINUATION of Theological Controversy—The Henoticon of Pope Zeno—The Acephali—Pope Felix III. excommunicates Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople—The Acoemetæ—Schism between Rome and Constantinople—Pope Gelasius I.—Pope Hormisdas—The Schism healed—Intolerance of the Emperor Justin I.—Pope John I.—Boethius—Election of Pope Felix IV.—Clovis—The Battle of Tolbiac—Baptism of Clovis by St. Remigius—Justinian, Emperor—Closes the Neo-Platonic School at Athens—Pope Agapetus at Constantinople—Belisarius—Pope Silverius—Totila—Narses—The Exarchs at Ravenna—The Empress Theodora and Pope Vigilius—Edict of the Three Chapters—Second Council of Constantinople—Pope Vigilius attributes his own conduct to the wiles of the Devil—Schism in the Western Church—The Emperor Justinian falls into the Heresy of the Aphthardocetæ—Character of Justinian—The Code, Pandects, and Institutes—The Christian Era established by Dionysius Exiguus—The Aphthardocetæ—Perpetuation of the Monophysite Schism—The Lombards gain possession of part of Italy—Their Character—Conversion of Spain to Orthodoxy—St. Benedict—Monte Casino—The Benedictine Rule—The Rule of St. Columban—The Mission of St. Columban—St. Gall—St. Kilian—Claim of John the Faster to the title of Œcumenical Bishop—Gregory I. becomes Pope.

THE Council of Chalcedon intensified rather than settled the theological difficulties. It was odious alike to the Nestorians and Monophysites, and was followed by a Monophysite controversy, which, accompanied by much violence and bloodshed, raged till the end of the Sixth Century, its decrees being accepted or rejected according to the bias of the prevailing Emperor. During the reign of Leo I. the Eutychians either yielded to the orthodoxy of the Emperor, or took refuge in the monasteries, so that his reign was one of comparative peace. But on his death the religious controversies broke out with renewed fury.

Leo I. was succeeded (A.D. 474) by his grandson, the son of Zeno by his daughter Ariadne; and on the death of the boy

Emperor, which occurred in the same year, Zeno himself became Emperor (474—475. Restored 477—491). In the next year Zeno was driven out by Basiliscus, the brother of the widowed Empress Verina; he being a Monophysite, issued an Encyclical letter condemning the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Pope Leo, and did all in his power during his short usurpation to appoint Eutychian Bishops. But Zeno, who made pretensions to orthodoxy, was enabled, A.D. 477, to resume the throne, which he continued to occupy till his death, A.D. 491.

The succession in some of the principal Sees at this time is so confused with the ever-recurring jargon of hard and unintelligible names, that it may be useful to give a connected summary of the occupants of the Patriarchal Sees during the years following the Council of Chalcedon.

On the death of Pope Leo I. the See of Rome passed, as has been already mentioned, to Hilary; he was succeeded by Simplicius (468—483), and then came Felix III. (483—492).

In 451 Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, had to make way for a time to a monk named Theodosius, who was supported by the monks, and by the widow of the Emperor Theodosius II.; but, she having been induced, through the influences of Pope Leo, to join the orthodox party, Juvenal was enabled to resume his See A.D. 453.

In 457 Proterius, who had succeeded Dioscorus in the Patriarchate of Alexandria, was murdered in his Baptistery, and Timothy, surnamed *Ælurus* (the *cat*), a Monophysite, who had been excommunicated by Proterius, and was instrumental in his murder, was appointed to the Patriarchate. But the arrangement did not suit the views of the Emperor Leo, so he was deprived and banished, another Timothy, with the strange name of Salophaciolus, a Catholic, being appointed in his stead. But on the accession of the usurper Basiliscus, Timothy *Ælurus*, who accepted his Encyclical, was restored, and on his death Peter Mongus (the *horse*) succeeded him in the Patriarchate. But

on the restoration of Zeno, the adherents of the Council of Chalcedon again came to the front; Peter Mongus was deposed and Salophaciolus reinstated.

Basiliscus appointed, or rather restored (for he had been deprived by Zeno), Peter Fuller, a monk who held Monophysite views, to the Patriarchate of Antioch. Peter had, in order to favour his own views, imported into the *Trisagion* the words "Who was crucified for us," meaning to imply thereby that Jesus, as God, suffered on the Cross. He made it to run thus;—"Holy God, Holy Almighty! Holy Immortal! Who was crucified for us, Have mercy upon us." Hence his followers were called *Theopaschites*, which is the Greek equivalent to the Patropassians of an earlier date. On the restoration of Zeno he was again deposed. But Zeno himself, who was constantly wavering between Catholic and Monophysite doctrine, again restored both him and Peter Mongus, on their accepting his Henoticon, of which mention will be made presently. The former dying A.D. 488 was succeeded in the Patriarchate of Antioch by Palladius, a Monophysite, whilst the latter on his death, A.D. 490, was succeeded by Athanasius, also a Monophysite.

The Patriarchate of Constantinople passed, A.D. 471, to Acacius, and on his death, A.D. 489, to Favritta; and who dying after four months, was succeeded by Euphemius.

In every other light but that of his Ecclesiastical rule (and as regards that he deserves little credit, for at heart he was a Monophysite, and only supported the orthodox party because he found it to his interest to do so), the character of Zeno was contemptible. It appears paradoxical that such a man should presume or care to define matters of religious belief. But Zeno viewed with dismay the religious distractions which for thirty years had agitated the Empire; and with the view to reconciling the discordant elements published, A.D. 482, by the advice, and probably in the words, of the Patriarch Acacius, his famous *Henoticon*, or Edict of Union. It pronounced an anathema

upon Nestorius and Eutyches ; confirmed the faith as laid down at Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus, and condemned all those by whom Christ is "divided, confused, or reduced to a phantom," and censured all other doctrines, if any such have been taught "either at Chalcedon or any council whatever."

It could not be expected that such a compromise would please all parties, or indeed any party. It was, however, accepted by the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, and found many other adherents in the Churches of the East. But the Catholics were offended with the Emperor taking upon himself to dictate to them on spiritual matters, nor were they over-pleased with the ambiguous language respecting the Council of Chalcedon, whilst they suspected Acacius of leaning towards Eutychianism. They accepted it, however, as a reasonable toleration. The extreme Eutychians of Egypt were even less favourably disposed towards it, and assuming the title of *Acephali*, or those who owned no head or Bishop, they separated themselves from the Patriarch of Alexandria. This title they afterwards exchanged for that of Jacobites, from Jacob Baradæus, who having received consecration from some Monophysite Bishops, A.D. 585, assumed the leadership of the party, and ordained Bishops and Clergy to minister amongst them. The Catholic party they stigmatised as Melchites, or followers of the Emperor's religion.

But the Henoticon was never accepted in Rome. Simplicius, Bishop of Rome, addressed to Acacius a letter of remonstrance on account of his communicating with Peter, now again Patriarch of Antioch, in respect to the latter being a Eutychian. Acacius replied that he was not only Patriarch of Antioch, but also an orthodox Bishop. Felix III., the successor of Simplicius, took the unprecedented step of citing Acacius to appear before him, and on his failing to do so, held a Synod in Rome, in which a sentence of excommunication was issued against him, and Acacius was sentenced to be deprived of his

Episcopal and Priestly orders, and separated from the Communion of the faithful. The sentence was communicated to Acacius by the *Acemete* (or sleepless ones), a society of monks, so called from their keeping up night and day an uninterrupted series of services. Acacius retaliated by issuing on August 1, A.D. 484, a counter-sentence of excommunication against Felix. Thus was caused a schism between the two Patriarchates which lasted for thirty-five years.

We may pass quickly over that period.

On the death of Favritta, A.D. 489, the next Patriarch of Constantinople, Euphemius, was a Catholic. Anastasius I. (491—518), who was at that time Emperor, is described as a man of profound piety, although he was accused of holding Arian and Monophysite doctrines. Being distracted by the differences between the Patriarchs, at a time when the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem were Catholics and those of Alexandria and Antioch Monophysites, he tried in vain to effect a reconciliation between them, but only impaired thereby his own reputation. His attempted reconciliation was rejected by Euphemius, who was in consequence, A.D. 496, deposed, and Macedonius chosen in his place; he also was, A.D. 510, deposed by the Emperor, and was succeeded by Timothy, a violent opponent of the Council of Chalcedon. And so matters went on, not only in Constantinople but also in the other Patriarchates, except that of Rome, now a Catholic and now a Monophysite occupying those Sees.

Meanwhile the schism between Rome and Constantinople continued. In vain had the Patriarch Euphemius and the Emperor made overtures of peace to Rome. Gelasius I. (492—496), the successor of Felix, put forth the highest pretensions for the Roman See, and, claiming that the promise made by our Lord to St. Peter included all the Bishops of Rome, demanded, as a preliminary condition of any agreement, that the name of the Patriarch Acacius should be expunged from the Diptychs.

There were, he said, only two powers, the Emperor and the Roman Pontiff, and of these the latter was the greater.

Anastasius II. (496—498), the successor of Gelasius, a Pontiff of gentler character, was willing, in the cause of peace, that the name of Acacius should be retained. But his Pontificate was of short duration, and his death put an end to the negotiations. The next Pope Symmachus (498—514), who after a contested election had obtained the Pontificate from the Italian King Theodoric, was accused by the Emperor Anastasius (who had wished his rival to be elected), of Manichæism, a charge which he retorted upon the Emperor. (For one year (A.D. 498), there was an Antipope, Laurence.) The healing of the schism, under the hands of two such opponents, was doomed to failure.

The Emperor Anastasius died A.D. 518, and was succeeded by Justin I. (518—527), a man sixty-eight years of age, and of inflexible orthodoxy, who from being an illiterate Dacian peasant, had risen to high command in the army; he now became nominal Emperor, the actual government being entrusted to his nephew, Justinian. Hormisdas (514—523), the successor of Symmachus, was at that time Pope. Timothy, Patriarch of Constantinople, died A.D. 518, and was succeeded by John, who finding the new Emperor zealous in the cause, entered upon fresh negotiations with Rome, and yielding to Hormisdas, consented to the names of Acacius, as well as those of the Emperors Zeno and Anastasius, being removed from the Diptychs. Thus the thirty-five years' schism was healed, and the Eastern and Western Church once more enjoyed a temporary peace.

Hormisdas styled the Emperor Justin, through whom he had been able to gain the victory over the Patriarch of Constantinople, a second Hezekiah. But John, unwilling to acknowledge any superiority of Rome over his own Patriarchate, obtained permission from Justin to assume the title of *Œcumenical* Bishop. Still Constantinople lost more than it had gained through its

submission to Rome, and the thin edge of the wedge to Rome's arrogant claims to supremacy over the East was then inserted. The yet recurrent feuds between the two Patriarchs grew fiercer and fiercer, till they at length culminated in a permanent schism.

Justin in his zeal for orthodoxy issued (A.D. 523) edicts by which Manichæans were ordered under pain of death to leave the Empire ; whilst other heretics, including Jews and Pagans, were forbidden to exercise their religion, and excluded from holding civil and military offices. An exception was made in the case of the Arian Gothic and other foreign soldiers who were engaged in the Empire.

This intolerance of Justin highly displeased Theodoric, the king of Italy, as opposed to the toleration which he had himself, though an Arian, observed towards the Catholic Christians. Theodoric, tolerant though he was of the Catholics, was a relentless enemy of the Pagans, whom he ordered to be put to death, and thenceforward Paganism disappeared from his dominions. Theodoric's toleration of Catholics was perhaps due to the fact that his mother was a Catholic, and that he himself was guided by the orthodox philosopher Boethius.

The Arians, too earnest to abandon their faith in obedience to the order of Justin, now threw themselves upon the protection of Theodoric. Theodoric wrote to Justin a letter of remonstrance, asserting that to claim dominion over the conscience is to usurp the prerogative of God ; that the power of sovereigns is limited to civil government, except in the case of those who were disturbers of the public peace. If his claims for the toleration of the Arians were not conceded, he threatened to retaliate upon the Catholics in his dominions.

But before coming to a rupture with the Emperor, he determined to despatch an embassy to the East, and for that purpose he selected the Pope, John I. (523—526), who had succeeded Hormisdas. The Pope, who unwillingly accepted a mission so foreign to his principles, set out in company of five other Bishops

and four Senators. Rarely had a Pope ever proceeded further from Rome than to Ravenna, and never before had a Pope visited the capital of the East. At Constantinople he was received with the highest honour by the whole city, and by the Emperor himself, who proceeded some ten miles to meet him, and falling on his knees, asked his blessing; whilst Epiphanius the Patriarch yielded him precedence in his Cathedral on Easter Day. As to the cause of the failure of the mission, authors differ, but certain it is that it did fail. The failure so irritated Theodoric that the Pope, on his return to Italy, was, together with the four Senators, cast into prison at Ravenna, where he died on May 27, A.D. 526. His body, which was conveyed from Ravenna to Rome, was buried in the Vatican, and Roman Catholics venerate his memory as of a Saint and Martyr.

The death of the Pope followed shortly after that of Boethius the eminent Christian Philosopher, which has left an indelible stain on the memory, in many respects glorious, of Theodoric. Boethius (470—525) had throughout his life been the zealous and successful defender of the faith against Arians, Nestorians, and Eutychians. His integrity and ability had so charmed Theodoric, that the highest honours and the chief authority and management of the State had been conferred upon him; whilst through him literature was cultivated with such success that the Augustan age seemed to be revived, and the Italians began to forget their subjection to their barbarian conquerors. He was thrice Consul, being, A.D. 510, as a distinction for his merits, appointed without a colleague. In 520 his two sons were appointed the Consuls for the year. Boethius, says Gibbon, might have been styled happy, if that precarious title can be applied to any one during his lifetime. But neither friends, nor virtues, nor riches could rescue him from the frowns of fortune.

In the last years of his life, Theodoric lent his ear to evil counsellors, who, to satisfy their own avarice, oppressed the

people with excessive and unjust taxes. Boethius, finding private access to the King no longer open to him, laid the grievances of the Provinces before him in the Senate House; he implored him to remember that Kings are given by Heaven for the happiness of their subjects, and to return to the former spirit, which had gained for him the affections of his people.

The King regarded the speech as an act of treason, and the ungrateful and obsequious Senate ordered him (A.D. 523) into banishment in the Castle of Pavia, where he employed his time in the preparation of his great work, *The Consolation of Philosophy*. On October 23, A.D. 525, after having been barbarously tortured, he was beheaded in a castle, mid-way between Pavia and Rome, in the fifty-fifth year of his reign. The cause of his death was doubtless complicated with his religion, for he had been the intimate friend of Pope John I., who had so recently begun to feel the severity of the anger of Theodosius. Thus, says Hallam, died the last of the classic writers of that age, and the ignorance which followed his death lasted for about five centuries; knowledge being mostly confined to the Clergy, and that consisting of just so much as was necessary for reading the Scriptures and Canons and authoritative documents of the Church.

The death of Theodoric himself followed at Ravenna (where he lies buried) on August 30, A.D. 526; he died, we are told, from a troubled conscience, expressing on his death-bed his deep sorrow and repentance of the murder. Although an Arian, and professing a regard for the dignity of the Papacy, he never resigned the supremacy which had always been held by the Emperors. In a disputed election, he himself adjudged the matter, and confirmed the election of Pope Symmachus, A.D. 498. The last act of his life was, in order to avoid the choice being made by the Romans, to appoint Felix IV. (526—530), a learned man and of blameless life, as successor to John I. In vain the clergy and laity of Rome objected to a Pope being

elected without their being allowed a voice in the election. The King came to an agreement with them that for the future, the election of the Pope should be made by the clergy and laity, but that he should not assume his office till it had been confirmed by the Sovereign.

In the reign of Theodoric, an event of the greatest importance to the Christian Church, or rather to the world, occurred. Beyond all the Teutonic tribes which settled down on the ruins of the Roman Empire, the Franks gained a paramount ascendancy; and that, as much, or perhaps principally, in consequence of the aid which they received from Christianity, than from any other cause.

During the reign of the Emperor Honorius, three tribes from Germany, the Visigoths and the Burgundians, both of them Arians, and the Salian Franks, who still preserved the worship of their ancient gods, gained a settlement in Gaul. Arianism became the prevalent religion of the country, but the question had still to be determined which of them, Arians or Franks, should gain the ascendancy, and determine the faith of the Gallican Church.

In 481 the leadership of the Franks fell into the hands of a singularly able Ruler, Chlodovich, whose German name was Ludwig, and his French name, under which he is generally known, Clovis, which was in later times transmuted into Louis, a name borne by eighteen kings of France.

Clovis, who, on the death of his father Childeric, had, at the age of fifteen years, succeeded to the small kingdom of the Salian Franks, was the means of founding the great monarchy of the French Nation, destined, in no great length of time, to become the most powerful of Catholic Nations, under the dynasty of the Merovingians, who received their name from Merovæus, the predecessor of Childeric.

There were still two parts of Gaul which remained unconquered from the Roman Empire, one which was held by the

Roman governour Syagrius, the other Armorica, which had been colonised from Britain. Clovis' first victory was gained A.D. 486, in a battle at Nogent, near Soissons, over Syagrius, whom (A.D. 489), following a habit too familiar to his cruel disposition, he put to death. By this victory, he extended his frontier to the river Loire, the boundary of the Visigothic kingdom. In 491 he gained possession of Tongres, and in 493 of Rheims.

Till he reached the age of thirty, Clovis followed the Pagan religion of his fathers. But, A.D. 493, he had married Clotilda, daughter of the Burgundian King, Chilperic, who, although living in an Arian Court, had become a Catholic. Clovis, although he remained obdurate as to his own conversion, so far yielded to the entreaties of his wife as to allow their two children to receive Christian Baptism. The first baptized of these two dying, Clovis imputed its death to its Baptism.

In 496 he gained the important victory of Tolbiac (Zülpich), near Cologne, and effected a settlement of Franks in the territory, which took the names of Franconia and Frankfort. During the battle, at a time when his life was exposed to imminent peril, he vowed that if he gained the victory he would become a Christian. The victory was gained; and after having been instructed in the Christian faith by St. Remigius, the great Bishop of Rheims, (who having been consecrated A.D. 457, at the age of twenty-two, held the See for seventy-four years), he was with three thousand of his followers, baptized by him in the Cathedral Church. When they reached the church, Remigius addressed him: "Sicambrian, gently bow thy neck; burn what thou hast worshipped, and worship what thou hast burnt." The phial (*ampulla*), the Sainte Ampulle, which held the Chrism of his Baptism, was the same which was afterwards used at the Consecration of the Kings of France, a ceremony performed in the Cathedral of Rheims till the present century. The legend that the phial was brought by a white dove from Heaven was first

recorded in the Ninth Century by Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims.

In 497 Clovis defeated the Armoricans, the inhabitants of the country between the Loire and the Seine. In 507, in a battle near Poitiers, he defeated the Visigoths under their King Alaric, son of the famous Euric, who on the extinction of the Western Empire, had received from the Italian King, Odoacer, all the Roman territory lying between the Loire and the Rhone. The Visigoths were thus driven from Gaul to effect a settlement in Spain.

The battle of Tolbiac was considered a religious battle, and the victory marked a turning-point in the history of Christianity, not only in Gaul, but also in Europe. It was the victory of the Catholic over the Arian Faith, and it decided that orthodoxy, and not Arianism, should be the religion of France and Germany. Clovis was the first King in the West who embraced the Catholic faith, and his successors on the throne of France received in consequence the title of Eldest sons of the Church. When he succeeded his father, there were six independent tribes of the Franks. During a rule of about thirty years (says Mr. W. C. Perry, in his *History of the Franks*), he not only united the various tribes under one powerful dynasty, and founded a kingdom in Gaul more extensive than that of modern France, on a broad and enduring basis, but made the throne the basis of union to by far the greater portion of the German race. The new settlements in Gaul received the name of Neustria, or Newland, Austrasia denoting the original seats of the Franks on what was afterwards called the German bank of the Rhine. The Merovingian dynasty continued until, as will be narrated in a future chapter, it was destroyed by the Carolingians.

Before Clovis died, his position was recognised by the whole world, not only by Theodoric in Italy, but by the Emperor Anastasius in the East, who from hatred and jealousy of his formidable rival Theodoric, rather than from any affection to

Clovis and the rising power of the Franks, conferred on him the dignity of Patrician and consul of Rome.

On the character of Clovis Christianity does not appear to have made an impression, and to the end of his days he continued treacherous and cruel. But a simple tale which is told of him seems to show that he was a man susceptible of good impressions. When Remigius read to him an account of the sufferings and death of the Saviour, he indignantly exclaimed; "If I had been there at the head of my victorious Franks, I would have avenged His injuries."

The Clergy of Gaul were firmly attached to Christianity, and Clovis found the Christians serviceable allies against his enemies. It was to his interest, therefore, to parade his Christianity; and it must have been from his external, rather than his practical Christianity that he found a prejudiced favourer in the pious St. Gregory of Tours (539—596), who, A.D. 573, was consecrated to the See formerly held by the great St. Martin.

Theodoric was succeeded on the throne of Italy by his unworthy grandson, Athalaric (526—534), a boy ten years of age, the son of his daughter Amasalunta.

In July, A.D. 527, Justinian became associated in the Empire with his uncle Justin, and on the death of the latter in the same year became sole Emperor, governing the Empire for thirty-eight years (527—565). The name of Justinian is the greatest which we meet with in the Sixth Century, until in its closing years we arrive at the time of Pope Gregory the Great.

Born at Sardica, Justinian was drawn forth by his uncle Justin, a thoroughly uneducated and ignorant man, who required the talents and ability of his nephew, to assist him in the government. Whilst he was exemplary, and even austere in his private life, he showed, at least till towards his last years, a strict, if somewhat intolerant, orthodoxy, one of his chief objects being to promote the spiritual and temporal good of the Church; he interested himself much in theological

questions, and aimed at being a religious no less than a civil legislator.

Immediately after his accession he admitted his wife Theodora, a woman of low birth, whom he had at first made, from an actress, his courtesan, to share with him the government. He himself was a Catholic, and an upholder of the doctrine of Chalcedon. She, as far as she had any religion at all, was a Monophysite; and by her superior strength of character gained a complete mastery over him, which extended to her appointing Bishops to the highest Sees, and even selling the Papacy.

In 529 Justinian, with the view of entirely eradicating Paganism, issued an edict for closing the Neo-Platonic School at Athens, the famous school where SS. Basil and Gregory Nazianzen, and the Emperor Julian were educated, and where the Philosophers, though bound to show an outward deference to Christianity, had been still able to give a life to Paganism by teaching it as an esoteric doctrine. Some of these Athenian philosophers, thinking it unsafe to remain any longer in the dominions of the Emperor, now threw themselves upon the hospitality of Chosroes I., the Pagan King of Persia. There they experienced a friendly reception; but finding the Magianism of the Persians even less to their minds than the Christianity of the Empire, they returned to their own country, where, through the intercession of Chosroes, they were allowed again to settle down, on condition of their not attempting to proselytise the Christians. Another edict in the same year rendered Pagans and heretics incapable of holding civil and military offices. Thenceforward the Pagan philosophy died out in the Eastern dominions of the Empire.

Epiphanius, Patriarch of Constantinople, dying A.D. 535, Anthimus, Bishop of Trebisonde, who was suspected of holding Eutychian doctrines, was, through the influence of Theodora, translated to that See.

In the previous year, Athalaric, the young King of Italy, had died after a reign of eight years, and through the influence of Amasalunta, Theodotus, the nephew of Theodoric, was called to the throne. Before the end of the year he caused her to be banished, and shortly afterwards she was found strangled in her bath. Theodotus hearing that Justinian was preparing an expedition against Italy, following the example of Theodoric, despatched Agapetus I. (535—536), who was then Pope, to Constantinople, to ward off, if possible, the impending invasion of Belisarius. Agapetus, attended by his Archdeacon Vigilius, arrived at Constantinople on February 2, A.D. 536, and at once refused to hold communion with the Patriarch Anthimus, who laboured under the double imputation, of holding Monophysite doctrine, and of having been translated from one Diocese to another, against the Nicene Canon. Justinian sternly ordered the Pope to communicate with his brother Patriarch. "I came hither," said Agapetus, "in my old age, expecting to find a religious and Christian Emperor, but I find a second Diocletian . . . I am ready to lay down my life for the faith." The Emperor, moved with respect and admiration of the Pope, called upon Anthimus to give an account of the faith that was in him, and having convicted him of Monophysitism, deposed him. Memnas, a man of deep piety and of great learning, was then appointed to the See and consecrated by the Pope of Rome.

The Pope, after the manner of Popes, taking advantage of the occasion to magnify the authority of the Papacy, stated in a circular letter that the heretical Patriarch had been deposed "by Apostolical authority with the concurrence of the most Christian Emperor." There is not a word in the whole transaction to justify the statement. But the deposition of Anthimus greatly grieved Theodora, who did all in her power to effect his restoration.

The Pope's intercession with Justinian availed nothing to

stop the invasion of Italy. Justinian, who had long viewed with jealousy the power of the Imperial lieutenants of Italy, determined to assert his legitimate but long dormant rights. Belisarius had already, A.D. 534, subdued Africa and destroyed the Vandal dominion in that country. In the following year he recovered Sicily and Naples from the Ostrogoths. On December 10, A.D. 536, he marched upon Rome.

Agapetus the Pope having died at Constantinople on April 17, A.D. 536, was succeeded by Silverius, a son of the late Pope Hormisdas, born before his father had taken Orders. The approach of Belisarius was welcomed by the Romans, who deposed Theodotus and appointed Vitiges to the throne. When the Senate and people, acting by the advice of the new Pope, opened the gates to the Imperialists, Vitiges and the Goths fled from Rome to Ravenna. Two years afterwards Belisarius took Vitiges a captive to Constantinople. He was succeeded in the kingdom of Italy by Evaric, and afterwards by Totila, who, A.D. 546, regained the conquests made by Belisarius. Pelagius, afterwards Pope, but at that time Archdeacon, of Rome, interceded successfully with Totila for the lives of the citizens; as to the city itself he was inexorable, and issued a decree that Rome should be converted into a pasture for cattle. This consummation however was warded off by Belisarius, who succeeded in persuading him not to destroy monuments, which were the glory of the dead and the pride of the living. In 552 Totila was killed in battle by Narses the successor to Belisarius in the command of the Imperial forces, who from being the favourite Eunuch of the Empress, was raised to the highest command in the army.

Italy was thus delivered from the yoke of the barbarians to which it had been so long subjected, and the name and race of the Ostrogoths perished for ever. Thus Rome was reunited in fact, as it had all along been in name, to the Roman Empire. Narses was the first of the Exarchs who, residing at Ravenna,

governed Italy for nearly two hundred years under the Eastern Empire.

The taking of Rome by Belisarius offered a favourable opportunity to Theodora for effecting her design of restoring Anthimus. But the strict orthodoxy of Sylverius stood in the way of the Empress and of Vigilius, whom she had brought over to her Monophysite views by the bribe of succession to the Papacy. Acting under their influence, and that of his wife Antonina, who was the confidante of the Empress, and who ruled him like Theodora did Justinian, Belisarius seized at Rome the Pope who had befriended him, and to whom he was indebted for his victory. After vainly endeavouring to persuade him to accede to the wishes of the Empress, to condemn the Council of Chalcedon, and to recognise Anthimus as Patriarch, the ungrateful conqueror charged him with a political offence; and the end was that Sylverius, stripped of his pontifical robes, and arrayed in the dress of a monk, was banished to Patara.

From Patara he managed to make his escape to Constantinople, where he laid his case and the hard treatment that had been meted out to him, before Justinian. The Emperor ordered his immediate return to Rome, promising that if the accusations brought against him proved to be untrue, he should be reinstated. But again Antonina exercised her influence with Belisarius, and means were adopted by which his return to Rome was intercepted by Vigilius, by whom Sylverius was banished to the Island of Pandataria, where he died on June 20, A.D. 538, but by what means was never discovered.

Meanwhile Vigilius (537—555), a thoroughly unprincipled man, and of grasping ambition, had been raised to the Pontificate on payment to Belisarius of two hundred pounds in gold, and on promises made to Theodora to acknowledge Anthimus as Patriarch of Constantinople, and to support Monophysitism.

Vigilius at once found himself landed in a dilemma. With regard to the doctrinal question the Emperor and Empress were

hopelessly at variance. In order to satisfy the Emperor, he was bound to assume the appearance of orthodoxy, and he accordingly declared his adherence to the Tome of Pope Leo and to the Four Councils. Theodora insisted on the performance of the promise which he made to her, so he again bound himself to Monophysitism.

Justinian desired to reconcile the Acephali^a, a section of the Monophysites, to the Church. Theodore Ascidas, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, himself a Monophysite, who had gained an ascendancy over the Emperor, persuaded him that the Acephali were not opposed to the Council of Chalcedon, but only to the writings of certain defunct Bishops, Theodore of Mopsuestia in Cilicia, who had been tutor to Nestorius, his pupil Theodore of Cyrus, and Ibas of Edessa, the first of whom had been recognised by that Council, whilst the last two had been distinctly pronounced orthodox. These Bishops, he said, were accused of Nestorianism, and the Monophysites could be won over to the Church by their condemnation.

Justinian accordingly issued, A.D. 544, the edict of the *Three Chapters* (the title of the works of the three Bishops), in which, without impugning the Council of Chalcedon, their writings were condemned, and this edict he required to be signed by all the Bishops. The Bishops of the East were favourable, whilst those in the West were opposed to the edict. Thus the controversy of the Three Chapters was kindled, of which it was said that it filled more volumes than it deserved lines.

Vigilius the Pope, being, A.D. 545, summoned to Constantinople, left Rome, loaded with the imprecations and assailed with showers of stones from the populace, as the murderer of Silverius. At Constantinople he was detained seven years. At first he refused to condemn the Three Chapters, but the Empress dying in the next year, he was thus delivered from one cause of his embarrassments. In 548, yielding to the commands

^a See p. 250.

of the Emperor, he issued a document called the *Judicatum*, agreeing with the Emperor's edict, and condemning the Three Chapters. Thus he thought to satisfy all parties, the Eastern Bishops by condemning the Chapters, the Westerns by not including the Council of Chalcedon in his condemnation. But he only added to his difficulties. A Council of Illyria, A.D. 549, defended the writings which he had condemned; an African Council in the next year excommunicated him, and some of his own Deacons who had accompanied him, charging him with disloyalty to the Council of Chalcedon, left Constantinople and returned to Rome.

It is unnecessary to wade through the various tergiversations of the Pope. Says Dean Milman of him;—He at least three times yielded to, and then desperately resisted Justinian; three times condemned the Three Chapters, and three times recanted the condemnation. The only way of extricating himself from the difficulties in which he was involved, was, he imagined, through a General Council; so he prevailed upon the Emperor, who was in almost equal perplexity, to summon one, he in the meantime withdrawing his *Judicatum*.

The Fifth General Council met at Constantinople in May, A.D. 553, probably under the Presidency of Eutychius, who in the previous year had succeeded Memnas in the Patriarchate. Domnus, the Patriarch of Antioch, and Apollinaris of Alexandria, attended it; Eustochius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, was represented by three Legates. The Council was attended in all by one hundred and sixty-five Eastern Bishops, those of the West, with the exception of five from Africa, holding aloof. Vigilius, who finding himself beset with difficulties on all sides had sought safety in the Church of St. Euphemia at Chalcedon, was with difficulty persuaded to return to Constantinople, and even then, under various excuses, refused to attend the Council.

He sent to Justinian a document entitled *Constitutum*, in which he adopted a middle course, condemning the Three

Chapters, but without naming the authors, on the ground that it was unlawful to anathematise the dead. The Council condemned the Three Chapters and anathematised Theodore of Mopsuestia himself. ("Tria Capitula anathematizamus; i.e. Theodorum impium Mopsuestium cum nefandis ejus conscriptis, et quæ impius Theodoretus conscripsit, et impiam epistolam quæ dicitur Ibæ.") It passed fourteen canons, in which the four previous Councils were confirmed; one canon was expressly levelled against the Origenists, or the followers of Origen, the great Christian teacher of the third century, whose works had frequently met with opponents, and had again been brought into prominence in the reign of Justinian.

Vigilius made his submission to the Emperor and to the decrees of the Council, attributing his late offences to the wiles of the devil. He might well have said the same as to other actions of his life. He had received the Papacy through bribery; he had caused the death of his predecessor; it was said that in a fit of passion he had killed one of his secretaries; and that he caused the son of one of his own sisters to be scourged to death. To say the least, his pronunciations *ex Cathedrâ* little resembled *Infallibility*, and were far from being so regarded by the Western Bishops of the time. Having made his peace with the Emperor, he was allowed to return homewards; but doubtless he was in no hurry to accomplish the journey, nor could he look forward to any friendly reception at Rome; on his way he died at Syracuse.

Pelagius I. (555—560), whom we saw as Archdeacon of Rome interceding with Totila for the lives of the citizens, was the next Pope, and accepted the decrees of the Fifth General Council. But he met with such opposition in enforcing them, that it resulted in a schism in the Western Church, the Bishops of Aquileia and Istria breaking off communion with Rome; a schism which lasted till A.D. 698, nearly a century and a half.

The Emperor Justinian died, A.D. 565, during the Papacy

of John III. (560—574), the successor of Pelagius. The Emperor in his last days tarnished his reputation for orthodoxy by embracing the doctrine of the Aphthardocetæ^b, and persecuting the Catholics. At the commencement of the year 565, he published an Edict forcing the doctrine on the Church, and Eutychius, Patriarch of Constantinople, was deposed for refusing to accept it; Anastasius, who had, A.D. 561, succeeded Domnus as Patriarch of Antioch, only escaping a similar fate through the death of the Emperor.

In the long reign of Justinian, which extended over nearly forty years, much of the ancient glory of the Roman Empire revived. Under him the Catholic faith advanced, and Arianism receded; the Vandals in Africa were conquered, and the Goths in Italy suppressed. But with many virtues he had many faults, the latter incidental to the union, under one head, of the Civil and Religious government, and liable to arise from an erroneous conception of the relations between Church and State. He greatly interested himself in the affairs of the Church, not only in the regulation of its discipline, but in settling theological questions and abstruse mysteries of the Faith; matters which would have been better left to the spiritual Heads of the Church. To the Secular government it appertains, not to dictate laws to the Church, but to see that the laws are properly observed. He wished no doubt to do the right thing, but he did it in the wrong way, and instead of promoting a general uniformity, he added to the theological distractions, and increased the divisions in the Eastern Church. He wrote a treatise against Origen, with respect to whose writings a fresh controversy had arisen in the Eastern Church. His incessant itching for religious disputations, and an overwhelming confidence in his own abilities, threw him off his balance, and landed him in the last days of his life in the Aphthardocetic heresy.

He adorned Constantinople and other cities in his dominions

^b See below, p. 269.

with stately Churches, hospitals, and magnificent edifices, erected at an enormous cost, and by money raised by very questionable means. To the Church, especially, he was a munificent benefactor, building numerous monasteries and churches; (in all twenty-four). Chief amongst these was that of Sta. Sophia at Constantinople, which he made one of the wonders of the world, he himself exclaiming on its completion with pardonable pride, "I have conquered thee, O Solomon." The original Church built by Constantine had been destroyed by fire, and another built to take its place had suffered a similar fate at the beginning of Justinian's reign. The new Church, in order to avoid a similar catastrophe, he built entirely of stone and marble. This Church, being before twenty years had passed partially destroyed by an earthquake, was again restored in the thirty-sixth year of his reign, as the structure stands in the present day. For its services he provided sixty Priests, one hundred Deacons, forty Deaconesses, ninety subdeacons, one hundred and ten Readers, twenty-five singers, and one hundred Ostiarians or door-keepers.

The laws of Justinian comprised in three works, the Code, the Pandects, and the Institutes, in which the most minute points of Church discipline, the relations of the Clergy to their Bishops, and the regulations of monasteries, form a conspicuous part, have thrown a perpetual lustre on his reign.

One event which occurred in his reign must not pass unnoticed, viz., the substitution of the Christian, or as it is called the Vulgar, Era, in the place of the Diocletian era which had hitherto prevailed. It is attributed to a monk, Dionysius Exiguus (about A.D. 532), who, although a Syrian, assumed the monastic habit in the Western Church. He placed the Nativity of our Lord in the year 3950 of the world, a date, however, which is now allowed to be four years too late. The new era only gradually superseded the former calculation. The first occasion on which it appears to have been used in Britain was in the reign of Ethelbert, who dates a document A.D. (*anno ab Incarnatione*

Christi) DCV. ; and Bede afterwards uses it in his history. In France it was sanctioned by Pipin and Charlemagne.

Dionysius also, who was well acquainted with the Greek and Latin Languages, made a collection of Decretals, beginning with the Pontificate of Siricius (384—398), and continuing to that of Anastasius II. (496—498). St. Isidore, Bishop of Seville, who died A.D. 636, made a similar collection.

The Aphthardocetic heresy into which Justinian fell, owed its origin to one of the numerous sects into which the Monophysites were split up ; one of which, the followers of Severus, Patriarch of Antioch, asserted that the Body of our Lord was liable to corruption ; whilst another party, following the teaching of Julian, Bishop of Halicarnassus, taught that the Human Nature was so absorbed in the Divine as to be incorruptible, or impassible of any corruption, except what He voluntarily underwent for man's redemption. Hence the latter were called Aphthardocetæ, the holders of a doctrine which struck at the very root of Christianity.

In spite of Councils, the Monophysite schism has never been healed. The Armenians, in a Synod held, A.D. 596, in Thurn, their capital, condemned the Council of Chalcedon, and continue to the present day to hold Aphthardocetic doctrines. Jacob Baradæus^c, at his death, left a flourishing communion of Jacobites, who usurped the See of the Patriarch of Antioch, which title the head of the Jacobites still continues to hold. And the Copts of Egypt, holding Aphthardocetic doctrines, have always had their own Patriarchs at Alexandria, professing to be the true successors of St. Mark, and claiming jurisdiction over the Bishops of Egypt, Nubia, and Abyssinia.

Justinian was succeeded by his nephew Justin II. (565—578). Belisarius died in the same year as Justinian ; Narses in 568. The immigration of the Teutonic nations was not stopped by the successful wars of the two great conquerors, whose death removed the two Generals who might have offered an effectual

^c p. 250.

resistance to the inroads of the barbarians. The fall of the Gothic power in Italy was followed, A.D. 568, in the reign of Justin II., by the irruption into Italy of another German tribe, the Arian Lombards. It has even been said that Narses himself had invited them.

Through the enmity of Sophia, the wife of Justin II., Narses had been superseded by Longinus in the Exarchate of Ravenna. The story goes that the Empress bade him "leave to *men* the exercise of war, and to return to his former state amongst the maidens of the Palace, where a distaff should again be placed in the hands of the eunuch." "I will weave her such a web as she will not easily unravel," was the indignant reply of Narses. To revenge his insult, Narses is said to have proceeded to Naples, and to have invited the Langobards (a German tribe so called from their *long beards*), a name softened into Lombards, to attack Italy. The Emperor Justinian had first invited them over, under their King Alboin, to assist him against the Gepidæ, a tribe occupying the opposite bank of the Danube to that previously occupied by the Goths. Invited by Narses, Alboin, A.D. 568, attacked and conquered a large part of Italy, giving the name of his followers to that part of the country which is called Lombardy.

Thus a Teutonic ascendancy was again established in Italy, the government of which country was thus divided into two unequal parts; the larger part under the Lombards, with their capital at Pavia, and the smaller part under the Exarchs of the Greek Emperor, with their capital at Ravenna. The Lombards were the last Teutonic tribe which settled in Italy, but by them Arianism, which had been driven out by Belisarius and Narses, was again introduced.

The Lombards were the most cruel and the least civilised of all the Arian conquerors of Italy. When they invaded that country they were ruthless barbarians, and the ferocity of their character was not influenced by their profession of Christianity.

They had, says Dean Milman, no awe of religious men, no reverence for religious places ; they burned churches, destroyed monasteries of males and females, slew ecclesiastics, shamefully treated the Virgins who consecrated their lives to the Church ; the whole country lay a solitude, cities depopulated, farms uncultivated, wild beasts wandering over the fields. So miserable and wide-spread was the desolation that prevailed, that it seemed to the Italians that the end of all things, was not merely approaching, but had already begun. At Rome they were always hated and feared, and even after their conversion to orthodoxy, and till the conquest of the Carlovingians, were a permanent thorn in the side of the Popes.

Towards the end of the Sixth Century Spain was recovered from Arianism. Riccared (586—601) succeeded his father, Herminigild, as King of the Visigoths in that country. His father, having married a Frank Princess who was a Catholic, abjured Arianism, but lost his life in a religious conflict between the Catholics and Arians. Riccared, as soon as he ascended the throne, together with the greater part of his subjects, abandoned Arianism, and proclaimed himself a Catholic. Conspiracies were plotted by the Arians, but he triumphed over them, and in a Synod at Toledo the Catholic Faith was established as the Religion of Spain. It may be mentioned that in this Synod the *Filioque Clause* ("and from the Son"), the fatal cause of contention between the Eastern and Western Churches, was first introduced into the Nicene Creed.

The Lombards were now the only people in the Empire who adhered to the Arian Creed. They also were converted to the orthodox faith, A.D. 599, through the influence of Pope Gregory the Great, and their orthodox Queen, Theodelinda, who had been a Bavarian Princess.

We cannot leave the Sixth Century without giving some account of St. Benedict, and the monastic movement with which his name is so intimately connected.

St. Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea, had drawn up a system of Rules, including Chastity, Poverty, and Obedience, which became the Rule adopted in the Monasteries of the East. But owing to the difference of climate and the habits of the people, Monasticism assumed a different character in the West, from that which prevailed in the East. The active employment which characterised the monks of the West was little suited to the hot Eastern climate; so that whilst the former combined their devotion with works of labour and usefulness, the monks of the East mostly confined themselves to a life of contemplation and asceticism.

The Western monks had hitherto followed the rule of Basil, which was imported into the West from the East. But after a time, when the first zeal for Monasticism had worn off, they not only threw off the uncongenial discipline, but refused to follow any Rule at all. Moreover, the Monasteries had grown rich, and the monks were given to luxurious and even worse living. Many sought the Monasteries, no longer as places for penitence and devotion, but where they might enjoy a tranquil and peaceable life. Thus the Monastic life, which had at first been embraced as a life of hardness and discipline, degenerated into one of ease and luxury, and even of licentiousness. A reformation was needed, and a Reformer arose in St. Benedict of Nursia.

Benedict (480–543) was born of an illustrious family at Nursia, in Umbria. Sent to Rome for education when he was twelve years of age, he soon became so shocked with the depravity which he witnessed, that in two years he left Rome privately, to lead a hermit life in the desert of Subiaco, or Sublaco, a place about forty miles from Rome. Here a monk named Romanus, of a neighbouring monastery, used to carry him such food as he could spare from his own scanty allowance, which he let down from a rock by a string. His retreat was in time discovered by some shepherds, whom he was in the habit

of teaching, and his fame so spread that many Roman nobles sent their sons to him for instruction. He was soon chosen Abbot of a neighbouring monastery, where however the monks were so opposed to his strict discipline that they sought his life, and he was compelled to return to his cave at Subiaco. Here he was joined by a number of enthusiastic followers, and was enabled to found twelve monasteries, each with an Abbot and twelve monks.

In 528 he founded the famous Monastery of Monte Casino, where he took up his residence, and drew up the Benedictine Rule. Thus Monte Casino was the cradle of the Benedictine Order, and the Rule of St. Benedict supplanted in the West the Rule of St. Basil, and held sway in the Monasteries of the Western Church till the rise of the Jesuits in the sixteenth century. Shortly afterwards his sister St. Scholastica founded and became Abbess of a Nunnery about five miles South of Monte Casino, which (as his biographer, St. Gregory the Great, says that Benedict governed a monastery of Nuns in the neighbourhood) we may suppose to have been subject to the Benedictine Rule.

The Rule of St. Benedict was less severe than that prescribed by St. Basil. A noviciate of twelve months was enjoined, during which the novice was allowed to return, if he liked, to his former life; if he chose to remain in the monastery beyond that time, he was then bound by a perpetual vow. Employment for body as well as mind was the Rule for all, rich (even Princes) and poor alike, the monks performing the servile work required to supply the necessities of the convent. All private property of the monks was surrendered to the monastery. Little conversation was allowed at any time; and none during meals, at which meat was never allowed, except for the sick; during meals one of the brethren was appointed to read passages from the Scriptures. At night they slept in the same coarse garments which they wore by day.

The monks of Britain followed a different Rule from the other monks of the West, which they derived from St. Columban (543—615). Born at Leinster, in the same year that St. Benedict died at Monte Casino, and trained in the monastery of Bangor in the County of Down, which had been founded by Congal, Columban, with the reluctant consent of Congal, the Abbot, accompanied by twelve monks, crossed over, A.D. 585, to Gaul; in Burgundy, of which he is called *the Apostle*, he was kindly received by the King, a grandson of Clovis; and establishing himself in the Vosges mountains, he founded three monasteries, the first at Annegray, another at Luxueil, eight miles distant, and a third at Fontaines, he himself presiding over all as Abbot. Luxueil, in Franche Compté, became the mother of other similar institutions in Gaul, which gave birth to many Saints and Bishops. But his proceedings did not find favour with the Bishops of Gaul.

Into the monasteries which he founded he introduced his own Rule, which was in many respects different to the Benedictine Rule, which latter, however, had received Papal sanction and support. He introduced the British usage in commemorating Easter, and other British institutions. His Rule, which was unreasonably severe, inflicting even corporal punishment for the slightest offences, joined to his own severity of life, was a standing protest against a worldly Priesthood and licentious Court. In 602 he was summoned before a Council of Gallican Bishops to answer for his ritual differences; he replied to the summons (although not in person, but) by letter, in which he explained that they did not originate with him, but were the customs of his national Church; and, whilst he recognised the supremacy of Rome over the Churches of the Roman obedience, he asserted the independence of his own Church. He wrote letters to Popes Gregory I. and Boniface III. and IV., in respectful language but with perfect freedom; and whilst he magnified the dignity of the Roman See, he placed

it below that of Jerusalem, "the place of the Lord's Resurrection."

In his later dealings with the Burgundian Court he had occasion to reprove the tyranny of Queen Brunhild, and the profligacy of her grandson, the young King Theodoric, who acted under her influence, and whom he threatened to excommunicate. Columban's bold and fearless rebukes so prevailed over the King, that he promised amendment. But these endeavours to thwart her schemes only rendered the wicked Brunhild more incensed against him; and he was in consequence, A.D. 610, expelled the kingdom. He then went to Metz, and afterwards to German Switzerland, where he preached on the Lakes of Zug, Zurich, and Constance. Leaving in Switzerland his fellow-countryman, and former pupil in the Monastery of Bangor, St. Gall, who founded the monastery which took his name, and gave its name to the Canton, he himself went into Italy, where he founded the famous Monastery of Bobbio near Pavia, and died A.D. 615. St. Gall died A.D. 640.

Whilst on this subject, we may mention the conversion of Franconia which was undertaken by an Irish monk, St. Kilian, who, arriving in the country, about A.D. 685, with two Irish companions, baptized numerous converts at Wurzburg, amongst whom was the Duke Gozbert. But Kilian having induced him to put away his wife, Geilana, the widow of his brother, on the ground that such a marriage was unlawful, Geilana in revenge caused the three missionaries to be put to death, A.D. 688.

Few events of ecclesiastical importance occurred between the Lombard invasions and the Pontificate of St. Gregory the Great. Pelagius^d, the Roman Pontiff, was succeeded by John III. (560—573). Next after him followed Benedict I. (574—578), and then Pelagius II. (578—590). In the Pontificate of Pelagius II. a serious divergence, and a cause of future estrangement between the Patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople, occurred. John the

^d See p. 266.

Faster, so called from his extreme abstinence, was Patriarch of Constantinople from A.D. 582—595. In 587 he assembled a Council of Eastern Bishops at Constantinople, to inquire into certain charges which had been made against Gregory, Patriarch of Antioch. At that Council he assumed the title which had been before used by several of his predecessors, of Œcumenical or universal Bishop. Pelagius, who viewed with jealousy the rapidly growing authority of Constantinople, protested against this assumption; but met with no success at Constantinople. Pelagius was succeeded by Gregory I., Maurice being Roman Emperor.

CHAPTER VIII.^a

THE CONVERSION OF THE ENGLISH.

LACK of Missionary zeal of the Welsh Church—The Roman Mission—St. Gregory the Great—The English Slave-boys at Rome—Gregory elected Pope—St. Augustine sent to Britain—Conversion of Kent—Augustine consecrated at Arles, Archbishop of the English—Gregory's advice to Augustine—Foundation of the Library at Canterbury—Augustine's two meetings with the Welsh Bishops—Points of difference between the Roman and British Churches—Conversion of Essex—The Bishoprics of London and Rochester—East Anglia—Death of St. Gregory—And of St. Augustine—Title of *Universal Bishop*—St. Gregory and the Emperors Maurice and Phocas—Laurence, Archbishop of Canterbury—Faintheartedness of the Roman Missionaries—Mellitus, Archbishop—Justus, Archbishop—Edwin, King of Northumbria—Bretwalda—Paulinus—Ill-success of the Roman Mission—Conversion of East Anglia—The Celtic Mission—Conversion of Ireland—Of Scotland—Iona—St. Aidan—Conversion of Wessex—Recovery of Northumberland—Penda—Conversion of Mercia—Recovery of Essex to Christianity—St. Finan—Conversion of Sussex—St. Cuthbert—Council of Whitby—St. Wilfrid—Theodore, Archbishop—St. Chad—Wilfrid preaches to the Freislanders—Wilfrid in Rome—His imprisonment—He converts Sussex—Synod of Hertford—Of Hatfield—Benedict Biscop—His foundations of Wearmouth and Jarrow—Endowments of the Church of England—The learning of the Church of England—Venerable Bede—Second Appeal of Wilfrid to Rome—His consequent disgrace—Synod of Nidd—Death of St. Wilfrid.

THE Celtic Church in Wales exhibited in one respect a remarkable contrast to its sister Churches of Ireland and Scotland. Whereas the Irish and Scotch Churches were the great missionaries throughout Europe North of the Alps, not one Cambrian, Welsh, or Cornish missionary, to any non-Celtic nation, is anywhere mentioned. We have already noticed the charge which Bede, following Gildas, brings against the Welsh Church at this time, viz., that "they never preached the faith to the Saxons or English who dwelt amongst them."

The conversion of our forefathers to Christianity proceeded

^a Much respecting the Church of England in this volume is derived from the author's own works on that Church.

from two sources, and extended over the period between A.D. 597—685. From A.D. 597—634 was the epoch of the Roman mission; from A.D. 635—685 was the period of, principally, the Celtic missions. It is with the former of these missions that we are concerned at present.

St. Gregory I., surnamed the Great, was Pope of Rome A.D. 590—604. Born about A.D. 540, he was descended from the illustrious and wealthy family of the Anicii, having a Pope, Felix (whether the third or fourth of that name does not appear), for his great-grandfather; whilst his father Gordian was of senatorial rank, although after the birth of Gregory he resigned his secular dignity to become one of the seven (afterwards Cardinal) Deacons of Rome. His mother Sylvia, on the death of her husband, consecrated her life to God, and entering a convent, was afterwards canonized. Gregory also had two Sainted Virgins for his aunts.

When Gregory was thirty-four years old, the Emperor Justin II. appointed him to the highest civil office in Rome, that of Prætor. After the death of his father he abandoned the secular life, and founded six monasteries in Sicily out of the estates which he inherited in that country, whilst his own palace at Rome, on the side of the Cœlian Hill, he converted into a convent in honour of St. Andrew; the rest of his property he distributed amongst the poor. In 575 he assumed the monastic habit, although not at first the Abbacy, in his own monastery.

In 579 Pope Pelagius II. made him one of the seven Deacons of Rome, and sent him to the Court of Constantinople as Apocrisiarius, or nuncio, to the Emperor Tiberius, who having been at first associated with Justin II., then reigned as sole Emperor (578—582). At Constantinople he displayed consummate ability as a nuncio; whilst as a religious controversialist he prevailed over the Patriarch Eutychius in upholding the doctrine of personal identity, against the Origenistic opinions of an impalpable body (as held by Eutychius), at the Resurrection.

Eutychius had, as has been before mentioned, probably presided at the Fifth General Council. After that, he fell into heresy, and was in consequence banished by the Emperor Justinian. Gregory now succeeded in thoroughly convincing him of his error, and on his death-bed (A.D. 582) Eutychius declared, "I believe that in the flesh we shall all rise again."

Whilst at Constantinople Gregory became Godfather to the eldest son of Maurice, who had married the daughter of Tiberius, whom he succeeded as Emperor (582—602).

In 584 he was recalled to Rome by Pelagius, when he assumed the Abbacy of his monastery, and was appointed Secretary to the Pope.

At this time the traffic in slaves was carried on extensively at Rome. The conquerors of Britain, which was broken up into several kingdoms, known as the Saxon Heptarchy, were frequently at war amongst themselves; and after one such war, between the King of Deira and the King of Bernicia, a group of English boy-slaves, who had been taken captive to Rome, were exhibited for sale in the market-place. Their white bodies, their fair faces and golden hair, so unlike the swarthy Italians, attracted the attention of the then Deacon Gregory. He was told by the slave-owner that they were Angles or English. "Not Angles, but *Angels* they might be," replied Gregory, "if only they were Christians." From what Province did they come? From Deira. The word suggested to him that they might be drawn from the *anger* (*de irá*) of God. How was the King of their Province called? Ella. Again the name seemed to be of happy omen, as suggestive of Hallelujah. He went to the Pope and suggested that a mission should be sent to preach Christianity amongst the English people, and offered himself for the service. Having obtained the required permission, he even started on the journey. But the Romans could not spare him; the whole city was in an uproar, and meeting the Pope as he was entering St. Peter's, requested that Gregory should be recalled.

In 590 the young Deacon himself was, by the unanimous voice of the Clergy and people, elected Pope in succession to Pelagius, who died of the plague which was ravaging the city.

In vain Gregory applied to the Emperor Maurice to withhold his confirmation of the election ; his letters were intercepted by the Prefect of the City. Rome was at that time troubled with a complication of misfortunes. The state of the Church was such that Gregory compared it with a violently shattered ship ; its timbers rotten, and shaken by daily storms. The number of the Clergy was inadequate to the population ; the Monks had grown worldly-minded, and, evading their Rule, had become lax in morals and discipline. The Lombards were overrunning Italy. The Tiber had overflown its banks, and destroyed the granaries at Rome.

Gregory entered upon the office which was thrust upon him by a public act of humiliation. He appointed a solemn Litany, (the pattern of our Litany, which comes nearer to it than does that of the Roman Missal), to be used in procession through the streets of Rome, to avert the prevailing pestilence.

A legend asserts that the plague was stopped by the appearance of St. Michael sheathing his sword over the Mausoleum of Hadrian ; thence called the Castle of St. Angelo, and adorned with the Angel's statue.

"Nothing," says Dean Milman, "was too great, nothing too small for his earnest personal solicitude. From the most minute points of ritual . . . he passes on to the conversion of Britain, the extirpation of Simony amongst the clergy of Gaul, negotiations with the armed conquerors of Italy, the revolutions of the Eastern Empire, the title of Universal Bishop usurped by John the Faster, of Constantinople."

He was the last of the great Latin Fathers ^b, and his unflagging activity is the more wonderful, when it is remembered that he

^b See p. 198.

always suffered from delicate health and frequently acute agony ; in 601 he wrote to a friend, "I am tormented with gout, death is the only remedy ; I am daily dying, but I cannot die." Yet he laboured diligently as a preacher. If in intellectual attainments he was not the equal of the other three great Fathers of the West, yet as a practical administrator he was inferior to none. He reorganised the Church and improved its ritual. He reformed the Sacramentary, or Missal, bringing it much as it remains in the present day. He reformed the Monastic life on the Rule of St. Benedict, and in a Lateran Council (A.D. 601) he exempted the monasteries from the oppressive jurisdiction, under which they suffered, from the Bishops. His book on *Pastoral Care* was for many years a manual both in the Western and Eastern Churches, and was translated by King Alfred into English. And to him we owe the plain song called the Gregorian Chant, which is the basis of Church-singing in the present day, as distinguished from the Ambrosian Chant which St. Ambrose introduced into the Church of Milan

A man himself of rigid simplicity of life, he showed in his daily life a munificent charity for others. He redeemed slaves and captives, sanctioning the sale of the consecrated vessels of the Church for such charitable purposes ; he frequently intervened in the cause of the oppressed and down-trodden, of widows and orphans ; he sent food daily from his own table to the sick and needy, before he sat down to his simple meal. Pilgrims also and strangers were the daily and hourly recipients of his bounty. Such was the distress and misery prevailing in Rome and the neighbourhood, owing to the ravages of war and famine, that three thousand noblemen and noble matrons accepted his munificence without blush or shame.

Gregory, says Gibbon, was the Father of his country. And, we may add, the piety of his character and his noble example during those calamitous times, conduced immensely to the

ascendancy of the Popes, and was one of the principal causes which led to their future aggrandisement.

The mission which he despatched to this country is of course the great event in his life which affects and interests us most. He never forgot that scene with the slave-boys in the market-place of Rome; now that he was Pope, he was in a position to carry out his long-cherished scheme. In 597 he despatched to Britain a mission consisting of about forty monks under Augustine, Prior of his own monastery at Rome. Their Christian wives and servants had no doubt to some extent influenced the minds of the English; indeed we learn from one of Gregory's epistles that they had expressed to him a desire for Christian instruction. Still they remained heathen, and Gregory blamed the French Bishops for their lukewarmness in not attempting their conversion. Yet we may doubt whether, under ordinary circumstances, any great number of the English would have lent an ear to the advocates of the religion of the conquered Britons, whom they deeply hated and thoroughly despised. But the time and circumstances were propitious. Ethelbert, the king of Kent, at that time the most powerful of the kingdoms of the Heptarchy, had taken as his wife Bertha, the daughter of Charibert, the Christian King of Paris, on the condition that she should be allowed the exercise of her own religion. She brought with her to Britain her own Chaplain, Luidhard, Bishop of Senlis, and Ethelbert gave them for their services the little church at Canterbury, dedicated to St. Martin, which had been erected during the Roman occupation.

The kind of missionary best adapted for the purpose would have been a man like Gregory himself. It is more than strange that Gregory, with his sound judgment, his knowledge of mankind, and with the great resources ready to his hand, should not have selected one better suited, than Augustine was, for the work. Augustine's one recommendation was the holiness of his life; but neither he nor his companions had any special aptitude,

whilst he himself had several drawbacks which unsuited him for so important a work. The life of a monk is not particularly adapted to fit a man, in many respects it is of a kind to unfit him, for the important work of a missionary, for which a knowledge of the world, and a large-hearted feeling towards opponents, are amongst the chief requisites. And no sooner was Augustine thrown on his own resources, than the weak points of his character began to reveal themselves, and his courage to fail him. When he and his companions arrived at the monastery of Lerins, and the monks in exaggerated language told him of the fierce reputation of the English people, they lost heart, and Augustine returned to Rome with the request that they might be relieved from the task.

The best thing that Gregory could have done would have been to recognise their inefficiency, to accept their resignation, and to look about for bolder missionaries. But he still trusted Augustine; so administering a gentle rebuke he encouraged him to resume his journey, at the same time giving him commendatory letters to the Gallican Princes and Prelates, to befriend the missionaries on their way through Gaul. Thus armed, these "strangers from Rome travelled onwards," and landed soon after Easter, A.D. 397, in the Isle of Thanet.

Thither, a few days afterwards, Ethelbert went to meet them on the way. The missionaries approached him, bearing such emblems of Christianity which his wife's use must have rendered familiar to him; a lofty silver Cross preceding, and a sacred banner with the picture of our Saviour following, Augustine. They chanted their Litany, and an interpreter explained to Ethelbert the object of the Mission. The king heard them attentively, and addressed them in kind but cautious language. "Your words are fair," he said; "but as they are new and of uncertain import, I cannot forsake the religion which I and the English nation have so long approved. But because you are come from afar, and impart to us those things as you

believe to be true, you shall be favourably entertained and receive necessary sustenance, and be allowed to preach and gain as many as you can to your religion."

This was as much as they could expect at the first meeting. He appointed them a lodging in the stable-gate at Durovernum (Canterbury), allowed them to preach as he had promised, and gave them sustenance. Onward they marched to their abode, Augustine, the dark and swarthy Italian, head and shoulders taller than his companions, leading the way. Again they lifted up the silver Cross and chanted their Litany; "We beseech Thee, O Lord, in all Thy mercy, that Thy anger and wrath may be turned away from this city and from Thy Holy House; for we have sinned. Alleluia."

Arrived in Canterbury, they celebrated their services in St. Martin's. Soon through their preaching and holy, self-denying lives, their watching and fasting, many believed and were baptized; the King without, Bede says, compelling any one to embrace Christianity, was himself by degrees drawn on, and on Sunday, June 1, received Baptism. Finding the work prospering in his hands, Augustine, pursuant to the orders given him by Gregory, went to Gaul, and on November 16 was consecrated Archbishop of the English by Virgilius, the Metropolitan of Arles.

Returning from Arles to Canterbury, Augustine received from Ethelbert (who is said to have retired to Reculver) his own Palace as a residence; he soon found the men of Kent ready to follow the example of their King, so that Gregory was enabled to announce in a letter to the Patriarch of Alexandria, that by Christmas Day of that year ten thousand converts had been gained over to Christianity.

Thus the mission was established, and the little Church of St. Martin outside the city had now become wholly inadequate for the number of converts. But Augustine found within the city a church which the Roman and British Christians had formerly used for their services. This church Ethelbert allowed

Augustine to restore, and he reconsecrated it in the name of the Saviour, on the spot where now stands Canterbury Cathedral. So that Christians worship on the very spot where Christians worshipped two centuries before the coming of Augustine. But as the English laws forbade the burial of the dead within the walls of the city, Augustine laid the foundation of a Monastery which took at first the names of SS. Peter and Paul, but afterwards that of St. Augustine; here Ethelbert himself erected a church and *enriched it with donations*. This monastery was meant to serve a double purpose, as a school for missionary work, and the burial-place of the Archbishops of Canterbury. On this site, as much as possible of the ancient structure being preserved, was built, A.D. 1844, the noble College of St. Augustine.

In the spring (A.D. 598) Augustine sent to Rome two messengers, Laurence, a Priest, and Peter, a Monk, to acquaint Gregory with the working of the mission and to ask his advice as to the management of his Province. Amongst other questions, one referred to the ritualistic differences between the Roman and Gallican Churches, and why there are different customs in different churches. Gregory had much to occupy his thoughts at the time; he was also suffering from ill-health; in a letter to a friend he says that for a long time he had been unable to rise from bed; that he was so tormented with the pains of gout that a kind of fire seemed to pervade his whole body. This no doubt accounts for his not sending a reply to Augustine's questions till A.D. 601. He did not insist, like his successors, in an absolute conformity with the Roman Church. He told him that whatever he found either in the Roman or Gallican Churches most acceptable to Almighty God, and whatever was pious and edifying in any Church, he should combine into one system, and teach to the Church of the English; for "things are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of things." To another question as

to how he was to deal with the Bishops of Gaul and Britain, Gregory felt that he could not deprive the Metropolitan of Arles of the authority which he possessed, and therefore gave him no jurisdiction over the Bishops of Gaul : those of Britain he committed to his care. But it is evident that the British Bishops were as independent of the Roman See as those of Gaul, and therefore Gregory was precluded from granting to Augustine a jurisdiction which he did not himself possess^c.

Gregory, in anticipation of a greater success than really attended the mission of Augustine, drew up a grand scheme for his guidance. The Pope probably thought that Augustine's See was established in London. There were to be, according to Gregory's plan, two Metropolitan Sees, one at London, the other at York, each with twelve Suffragan Bishops ; and after Augustine's death they were to take precedence according to their seniority. Thus London and not Canterbury was to be the See of the Southern Metropolitan. It had however been already established at Canterbury, and there it has remained ever since.

Gregory also directs him not to destroy the heathen Temples, but to convert them into Christian Churches ; and as it was impossible all at once to efface everything from their obdurate minds, to allow the new converts at their festivities to kill cattle, according to their ancient custom, but no longer in honour of the Pagan deities, but to the glory of God. This, says Schaff in his *History of the Christian Church*, no doubt facilitated the conversion of England, but swept a vast amount of heathenism into the Christian Church which it took long to eradicate.

Gregory now sent to Augustine the Pall of a Metropolitan, and four new Missionaries, amongst whom were Mellitus, Justus, and Paulinus ; and with them sacred vessels, altar-cloths and vestments, and a valuable present of books. Amongst the books were a Bible in two volumes, two copies of the Psalms, two of the Gospels, a book of Lives of the Apostles and Mar-

^c See p. 274.

tyrs, and a Commentary on the Gospel and Epistles. Thus was laid the nucleus of a library and the foundation of the learning for which England afterwards, and Canterbury in particular, became famous.

Augustine, relying on the authority which Gregory thought to give him, sought to come to an understanding with the British Church of Wales, and under safe conduct from Ethelbert, held, A.D. 603, two conferences with them, the first at a place called Augustine's Oak, on the river Severn. The principal points on which the Irish and British Churches differed from the Roman were as to the time of keeping Easter, the clerical tonsure, the marriage of the Clergy, a peculiar Liturgy, and a distinct Rule observed in the Monasteries. Augustine at once charged them with heresy, telling them that they did many things at variance with the Catholic Church. With their other peculiar usages he said he would bear, but he insisted on three points; the right time for observing Easter, the administration of Baptism according to the usage of the Roman Church, and that they should join him in the conversion of the English.

Such arrogant and dictatorial language was a bad commencement. The British Bishops, who were as intractable as Augustine, refused his terms.

A second conference was then arranged. Seven Bishops and many learned from the Monastery of Bangor-Iscoed, under their Abbot Dunawd, or Dinooth (as Bede calls him), were present. On their way to the conference they consulted a holy hermit as to whether they ought, at the bidding of Augustine, to abandon their traditions. "If he be a man of God," said the hermit, "obey him." "But how were they to determine this?" they asked him. "If he did not rise to them," the hermit told them, "he could not be like Christ, meek and lowly of heart, and his words should not be regarded."

Augustine received them sitting. He again insisted on the three points. The Bishops followed the advice of the hermit;

“If he will not rise to us now,” they said, “how much more will he condemn us, if we are under his subjection;” so they determined that they would do none of these things, nor receive him as their Archbishop.

As regards the chief point of difference between the Roman and British Churches—the time of keeping Easter—it was not one of doctrinal, but of ritual observance. The British Churches always kept their Easter on a Sunday, and were not therefore like the Quarto-decimans^b of the Second Century who, following the rule of the Jewish Passover, kept Easter on the *fourteenth* day, whether it fell on Sunday or not, of the first Jewish month. The Great Council of Nice, A.D. 325, had decided that Easter should always be kept on a Sunday. As Constantine summoned Bishops to Nice “from *all* Provinces,” it can scarcely be supposed that he would overlook the Bishops of his own Province, Britain. If British Bishops were present at the Council of Nice it is unlikely that they would have lived in wilful disobedience of that Council; we must conclude therefore either that Bishops from Britain were not present at it, or that in their isolation from Christendom they had forgotten its Canons. Augustine pressed on them the right thing, but in the wrong way.

The difference as to Baptism was probably in regard of the trine immersion of the Romans, and the simple immersion practised in the British Church.

The disappointment which he felt at his ill success with the British Bishops must have in some degree been compensated by a brighter prospect which seemed to open nearer home. Sigebert, or Sabert, king of Essex, son of Ethelbert’s sister Rícula, was converted to the faith by Mellitus, who was, A.D. 604, consecrated Bishop of London. Ethelbert and Sabert together built the West Minster, which under Edward the Confessor rose into Westminster Abbey.

^d See p. 105.

A third See was in the same year created at Rochester, where Ethelbert built at his own expense a Cathedral, of which Justus became Bishop.

Redwald, King of the East Anglians, who was also induced by Ethelbert to accept Baptism, thought to combine Christianity and Paganism. Under such a half-hearted King no Bishopric was established in his kingdom.

Pope Gregory died A.D. 604, and two months afterward^s Augustine died. St. Augustine was not a great man, nor a successful missionary, for which he was too narrow-minded and unconciliatory. Yet the English Church owes him a debt of gratitude. He laid the foundation, as Bede says, *nobly* of the Church of England. He renewed the union which the English conquest had broken with Western Christendom. He founded the See of Canterbury, the See of the Pope of another world (*alterius orbis Papa*) as he was called in the early Church, and from him the Church of England derives the succession of its Bishops. But Augustine himself did not derive his own consecration from Rome, but from the Gallican Metropolitan of Arles; just like (if we are correct as to its foundation*) the British Church owed its first succession, which was in Britain interrupted by the English Conquest, to Gaul. Augustine also laid the foundation of the political Unity of England; for whilst there were at least seven Kings of the Heptarchy, there was only one Archbishop, and one recognised law, the law of the Church; so that the lesson was taught that, if there was one Bishop over the Church, there might in like manner be one King over all England.

There were other things done by him which were unfortunate. By his over-bearing conduct he cemented the long-lasting enmity between the Roman and Celtic communions. Through him, too, Latin, at the time when the Latin language had become obsolete, was adopted as the language of the Church. He failed to see

* See p. III.

that the same reason which led men to pray in Latin at Rome, should lead them to pray in English at Canterbury. Through him the absurd custom became established of people being supposed to pray in a language of which they understand not a word.

St. Gregory the Great, by the gentleness and tenderness of his character, by his humility and earnestness, stands out as one of the greatest of the Popes. But he was no Pope in the modern acceptation of the term, and the religion of the Rome over which he presided, and that of mediæval and modern Rome, are two almost essentially different religions. "The servant of the servants of God" (*servus servorum Dei*), as he styled himself, laid no claim to the infallibility of the Church of Rome. A certain Primacy of honour was always conceded to the Patriarch of Rome; but Gregory abjured a *universal* Episcopate, and addressed the other four Patriarchs as his equals and co-ordinate Rulers of the Church.

He had the full inherent belief of a Pope in the Papacy, which for more than two hundred years had been advancing its pretensions, and no doubt would willingly have magnified his office; but acting in the spirit of the General Councils, he denounced anyone who claimed to be universal Bishop over the whole Church as "the precursor of Antichrist."

The title of universal, or œcumenical, Bishop, was an honorary one, applied by Emperors more than once to the Patriarchs, but limited by Councils more particularly to the two Patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople. John, Patriarch of Constantinople, styled from the austerity of his life *the Faster*, frequently claimed the title for himself; but Pope Gregory, in a letter to the Emperor Maurice, states that though it was granted to the See of Rome by the Council of Chalcedon, his predecessors had never used the *blasphemous* title. He wrote to the Emperor and the Patriarch himself, and did all in his power, to procure its revocation of what he went so far as to call a diabolical usurpation. He wrote also to the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch

against it, and on the death of John the Faster, A.D. 596, he wrote to his successor in the See, Cyriacus, claiming the rejection of the title as the condition of communion.

In connection with the Emperor Maurice occurred the one event in his life which has left an indelible strain on Gregory's character, which it is impossible, in a man of such saintly life, to explain or understand. Before the one became Emperor and the other Pope, they were friends, and, as has been already stated, when he was in Constantinople, Gregory was chosen Godfather to Maurice's son. But no sooner did Gregory become Pope, than Maurice's friendship underwent a change, and instead of supporting, he seized every opportunity of thwarting him. When in the troublous times which overwhelmed Italy, when no help could be procured from the Emperor at Constantinople, nor from the Exarch at Ravenna, Gregory had come to the rescue and saved the country. But he only excited the jealousy of Maurice, who resented his conduct as an interference in the political affairs of the Empire.

Thenceforward the Emperor was persistent in his endeavours to oppose him. But Gregory never flinched in the path of duty; and when Maurice forbade soldiers, on the completion of their term of service, to become monks, Gregory hesitated not to denounce it as a flagrant act of impiety whereby the Emperor imperilled his own soul. And again, when Gregory represented to him the usurpation, by the Patriarch of Constantinople, of the title of universal Bishop, Maurice lent a deaf ear to his protest, and connived at, if he did not actually sanction, the act which he complained of.

In 602 Maurice, after having witnessed the execution of his three sons, was himself murdered in a rebellion at Constantinople by a vulgar and deformed Centurion, named Phocas, a very monster of vice and cruelty. So obscure was the man that Maurice, who had never before heard of his existence, when he was told that, though bold in sedition, he was timid under

danger, exclaimed, "Alas! if he is a coward, he will also be a murderer." Obscure as Phocas was, he succeeded Maurice as Emperor (602—610), and inaugurated his reign by even a more cruel murder, on the same spot where her husband and sons had fallen, of the Empress Constantina and her three daughters.

If Maurice's treatment of Gregory in some measure explains, it does not excuse, the subsequent conduct of the Pope. Gregory hailed with pleasure the exaltation of the sanguinary tyrant; addressed him in terms of praise and adulation, and placed his portrait and that of his wife (a woman little better than Phocas himself) in his private chapel. Phocas saw how it was to his advantage to favour the Roman See, and to depress that of Constantinople. He had also a private grudge against the new Patriarch Cyriacus, on the ground of his having given an asylum to the wife and daughters of Maurice. Cyriacus was compelled to abandon the title of universal Bishop (which, however, was restored to the Patriarchate by the sixth General Council, A.D. 681), and Phocas acknowledged the Church of Rome as "the Head of all Churches."

On the death of St. Augustine, Laurence, one of the original missionaries from Rome, succeeded as second Archbishop of Canterbury. He proceeded to deal with the Irish Bishops in a more conciliatory manner than Augustine had used to the British Bishops. But he announced his failure in a letter to "our dearest brothers, the Lords, Bishops, and Abbots throughout all Scotia," (i.e. Ireland); he had expected to find the Irish more tractable than the Welsh; but an Irish Bishop, when recently on a visit to Canterbury, had refused so much as to eat in the same house as the Roman missionaries.

King Ethelbert dying A.D. 616, was succeeded by his son Eadbald, under whom Laurence saw the Canterbury mission brought to the very verge of ruin. Eadbald renounced Christianity. The Kingdom of Essex also relapsed into Paganism, and Mellitus the Bishop was compelled to leave Essex. So

disheartened were the three Bishops, that Mellitus and Justus gave up the mission and actually crossed over to Gaul, and Laurence was only prevented by a miracle from following their example. Eadbald was so frightened with Laurence's account of the miracle, and the marks which he bore on his body of the severe scourging which he had received from St. Peter for his cowardice, that he renounced an unlawful marriage which he had contracted with his step-mother, and was baptized. Thus was Kent reclaimed to the Faith, and Eadbald became to the Church a second Ethelbert. He reinstated Justus in the See of Rochester; but the Londoners still refused to receive back Mellitus.

On the death of Archbishop Laurence, A.D. 619, Mellitus became third Archbishop of Canterbury; and on his death, A.D. 624, Justus, being the only Bishop of the Roman mission left, appointed himself as fourth Archbishop; and he consecrated Romanus as his successor at Rochester.

We must now pass to the North of England, to the kingdom of Northumbria, which had become the most powerful kingdom in the Heptarchy.

Edwin, who has left his name in Edinburgh (*Edwin's Burg*), son of that Ella whose name St. Gregory had associated with *Alleluia*, became, A.D. 617, King of Northumbria, and Bretwalda, or Lord of Britain. In 625 he married Ethelburga, sister of Eadbald, the Christian King of Kent, on condition that she should be allowed to follow her religion, Ethelburga taking to his court her chaplain Paulinus, who had been consecrated a Bishop by Justus. Edwin allowed his daughter Fanfleda to receive baptism from Paulinus; and on Easter-Day, A.D. 627, he himself, with the nobles and chief men of his kingdom and his grand-niece Hilda, was baptized in a church which he hastily built at York. He appointed Paulinus as Bishop of the See of York, and set himself to the building of a noble church on the site where now stands York Minster.

Edwin and Paulinus laboured together for six years with such great success that, through them, Northumbria, and the neighbouring country as far as Lincoln, and a large part of North Britain, embraced the Gospel.

Others, however, attribute the conversion of Edwin to a Welshman, named Rum or Run. The account given above is taken from Bede. Perhaps the two accounts may be reconciled by supposing that Run and Paulinus are the same person; that Run being ordained at Rome, changed (as was not uncommon) his Celtic name for the more euphonious Roman name, Paulinus.

Let us now take a review of the Roman Mission. Archbishop Justus died A.D. 627, and in the same year Romanus, Bishop of Rochester, was drowned at sea. So that Paulinus was now the only Bishop left in Britain. Under these circumstances Pope Honorius I. (625—638), disappointed with the collapse of the Roman mission, appointed an Italian, also called Honorius, who was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury at Lincoln by the sole ministry of Paulinus. A pall also was sent by the Pope to confer a metropolitan rank on Paulinus.

But before it arrived a terrible calamity had visited Northumbria and its Church. Penda, the Pagan King of Mercia, and the persistent foe of Christianity, having been joined by the Welsh, under Cadwallon the Christian King of North Wales, defeated and slew Edwin and his son Osfrid on October 12, A.D. 633, in the battle of Heathfield, near Doncaster. This was a sad blow to Christianity. Ethelburga together with her daughter Eanfleda and Paulinus, fled to Canterbury, and Paulinus was appointed to the vacant See of Rochester. James the Deacon, and no doubt others more resolute than Paulinus, remained behind, and prevented the faith from utterly dying out in Northumbria; but Paganism was for a time re-established in the kingdom.

Before this event occurred, another kingdom, East Anglia,

had become Christian. Eorpwald, the son of the wavering Redwald, had been, A.D. 628, induced by Edwin to profess a more earnest Christianity than his father, but in the same year he was murdered by his lukewarm subjects. His brother Sigebert, who then succeeded to the East Anglian throne, having when an exile in Gaul embraced Christianity, now persuaded a Burgundian monk named Felix to come over and preach in his kingdom. Felix was consecrated Bishop of Dunwich on the coast of Suffolk; and being joined two years afterwards by a Celtic monk from Ireland, named Fursey, the Church was by their means firmly established in the kingdom of East Anglia.

The Church in Northumbria soon began to look up again. Ethelfrith, the predecessor of Edwin, had left three sons, Eanfrid, Oswald, and Oswy, all of whom became kings in Northumbria; and one daughter. Eanfrid succeeded Edwin in Bernicia, and Osric, Edwin's nephew, in Deira; both of them had been Christians, but both renounced the faith, and were killed in battle by Cadwallon. Oswald, the second son, "a man beloved of God," says Bede, became, A.D. 634, King of the reunited kingdom of Northumberland, and Bretwalda. At the end of the year Oswald defeated and slew Cadwallon at the battle of Heavenfield, near Hexham. Heavenfield more than made up for Heathfield, and Oswald was to the Church all that Edwin had been before him.

We have hitherto spoken of the Roman Mission to Britain. We have now to speak of the Celtic Mission, to which the Church of England owes (it would be invidious to say a greater), but at least as great a debt of gratitude as to St. Gregory. But before proceeding further, it will be necessary to give a short sketch of two Churches, those of Ireland and Scotland, which, with the Churches of Britain and Wales, made up from early times the Celtic Communion in the British Isles.

The conquest of Ireland (or as it was then called Scotia), and

that of Scotland, was never effected by the Romans, and consequently they were never subject to the See of Rome. Nor was their conquest effected during the English conquest of Britain.

At what time the Gospel was first preached in Ireland (or Scotia), is uncertain. We are told that Palladius, a monk from Britain, having been consecrated (A.D. 429) a Bishop by Pope Celestine, went two years afterwards to the already converted Scots (*ad Scotos in Christum credentes*). But his mission was a failure. Another mission was undertaken shortly afterwards (A.D. 432) by St. Patrick (387—493), or Succoth, who is known as the *Apostle of the Irish*. His native village was Bonavern, generally identified with the modern Kilpatrick; his father Calphurnius was a Deacon, and his grandfather Politus a Priest, his mother being a sister of St. Martin of Tours. Having studied first in the monastery, lately founded by St. Martin, at Tours, and afterwards under St. German of Auxerre, and having been ordained (probably in Gaul) a Bishop, he headed a mission of monks to Ireland, where he founded several monasteries, which afterwards became famous schools of learning and piety. But after his death, Christianity having declined in Ireland, was recruited by missions from Britain; the monastic system was stimulated to a great work; a native clergy was educated; and the Church became so famous that Ireland was called the Island of Saints; from it proceeded the most learned scholars and missionaries, who carried the Gospel not only to Scotland, but to France, to Germany, to Switzerland, to Italy North of the Alps, even to the distant Faroe Islands, and to Iceland.

The Gospel was first preached to the Southern Picts of Scotland by St. Ninian, the son of a British chief, in the early part of the Fifth Century. Having been consecrated a missionary Bishop by St. Martin of Tours, he fixed his See at Whithern in Galloway. After his death, his work was carried on by St. Kentigern (or St. Mungo), who is called the *Apostle of Strathclyde*, who being consecrated a Bishop about A.D. 552 founded the See of Glasgow.

But St. Columba (521—597) is pre-eminently called the *Apostle of Scotland*. He, a man of royal birth, and Abbot of one of St. Patrick's monasteries, crossed over to Scotland on a mission to the Northern Picts, and founded the famous monastery of Hy, or Iona, over which he himself ruled as Abbot. Iona soon became a famous seat of religion and learning, the head of other monasteries in Scotland and Ireland; and the centre from which proceeded the noble band of missionaries, who, under the name of Culdees (*Cultores Dei*), carried the Gospel through the greater part of Pagan Britain.

Columba, it may be mentioned, died in the very year in which St. Augustine arrived in Britain.

We now return to the Northumbrian Church.

Having been educated in the monastery of Iona, Oswald turned thither his thoughts for a missionary to his kingdom. St. Aidan, whom Bede describes as a man of the greatest gentleness and piety, was selected as the most fitting person, and having been ordained a Bishop, he fixed his See at Lindisfarne, which thenceforward became the centre of the Celtic, as Canterbury was of the Roman Mission, and to Lindisfarne monks flocked from Iona. Aidan formed a school of twelve English boys, whom he trained for mission-work in their own country; and churches and monasteries, built and endowed by the king's bounty, arose everywhere on the model and discipline of Iona.

Through Oswald, the way was paved for the conversion of Wessex. Pope Honorius despatched (A.D. 634) a Roman monk named Birinus to Britain, who on his way thither received consecration from Asterius, Bishop of Milan, and settling in Wessex, fixed his See at Dorchester, near Oxford. At that time Oswald arrived in Wessex to seek the daughter of the king Cynegils in marriage, and by his holy example and the preaching of Birinus, the King was converted and baptized at Dorchester, Oswald, who soon afterwards married his daughter, standing as Godfather.

On August 5, A.D. 642, Oswald was slain by Penda in a battle near the town which after him is called Oswestry. "He ended his life in Prayer," says Bede, his last words entreating the blessing of God on his soldiers. His body was terribly mutilated, but in the next year, his head, separated from the body, was recovered by Aidan, and eventually placed in the coffin of St. Cuthbert at Lindisfarne. When the coffin of St. Cuthbert was opened (A.D. 1104), William of Malmesbury says, the head of St. Oswald, King and Martyr, was found between his arms; thence the common representation of St. Cuthbert, holding the head of St. Oswald in his hands.

Oswald was succeeded in Bernicia by his brother Oswy, who had married Eanfleda, the daughter of Edwin and Ethelburga; and in Deira by Oswin, the son of Osric. Oswin ("too good for this world," it was said of him) was murdered on August 20, A.D. 651, by Oswy, who coveted Deira. This was the one great blot in Oswy's life, but it broke St. Aidan's heart, who only survived Oswin eleven days. Northumbria became again united, Christianity firmly established under Oswy, and the days of Paganism in Britain were numbered.

One struggle more, however, Penda made against the advancing Christianity. He had, A.D. 654, defeated and slain in battle Anna, the Christian King of the East Anglians. In vain Oswy tried by bribes of gold and costly presents to keep the peace. The battle that was to decide between Christianity and Paganism was fought at Wingfield, on November 15, A.D. 655; Penda was defeated and slain, and with him fell Paganism. On his way to battle Oswy vowed that if victorious, he would dedicate to God his young daughter Elfleda, and found twelve monasteries. The monasteries were founded, and he placed Elfleda in the monastery of Hartlepool, of which Hilda was superior.

But before the death of the champion of Paganism, his own kingdom, Mercia, had been converted by means of his son

Peada, ("an excellent youth, and most worthy of the title of King," Bede says of him), who had (A.D. 653) married Oswy's daughter. Having been baptized by Finan, the successor of Aidan in the See of Lindisfarne, he took with him Cedd, a Northumbrian, the brother of St. Chad, of whom we shall hear more in the sequel, and Diuma, a Scot, to preach the Gospel in Mercia; the latter was, A.D. 656, consecrated a Bishop by Finan, with his See at Repton, which was afterwards transferred to Lichfield, the capital of the kingdom.

Sigebert, surnamed the *Good*, King of Essex, was baptized by St. Finan at the same time as Peada. The Gospel was preached in Essex by Cedd, who (A.D. 654) was consecrated Bishop of London by Finan and two other Scotch Bishops. Thus nearly forty years after its relapse into Paganism, Essex was recovered to Christianity; but it was by Celtic, not Roman, missionaries.

The last converted of the English kingdom was Sussex, its conversion being effected by Wilfrid (A.D. 681). Of the preliminary history of this remarkable man, a short account must be given. Born A.D. 634, the son of a Thane in Bernicia, he was sent by Eanfleda, the wife of King Oswy of Northumbria, to the monastery of Lindisfarne. Educated there under the Celtic monks, it might have been expected that he would continue an adherent of the Celtic communion. Instead of that, he imbibed a dislike of everything Celtic and a preference for everything Roman. The Queen continued his patroness, and by her he was sent first to the Court of Kent, and (A.D. 654), in company of Benedict Biscop, a nobly born Northumbrian, to Rome. At Rome his Celtic dislikes and his Roman prejudices were fostered, and returning to Northumberland, he was (A.D. 661) appointed by Alchfrith, the son of Oswy, to his newly-founded monastery at Ripon. Alchfrith, who belonged to the Celtic communion, had at first placed the monastery under the care of Eata the Abbot, and Cuthbert, one of the monks, of Melrose.

But having been brought over to the Roman communion by his mother Eanfleda, he dismissed the Celtic monks of Melrose, and appointed Wilfrid Abbot of the monastery.

Thus there were two parties, the Celtic and the Roman, which necessitated a diversity of practice, especially with regard to Easter, in the Northumbrian Court. Whilst one party was observing the Lenten Fast, the other was celebrating the Easter Festival. The King, who was a kind of Gallio, favouring neither the one party nor the other, but who was opposed to such a divergence in his own palace, held the Council of Streneshalch, or (to call it by its Danish and modern name) Whitby (A.D. 664), to determine the question. The Council was held in the monastery which had (A.D. 657) been founded, and was now presided over, by Hilda, the former Abbess of Hartlepool. The King presided; the Celtic party were represented by Colman, who was at that time Bishop of Lindisfarne, by Cedd of London, and the Abbess Hilda; whilst Agilbert, who had succeeded Birinus as Bishop of Dorchester, and Wilfrid, represented the Roman party. Colman referred the Celtic custom to SS. John and Columba, whilst Wilfrid referred that of Rome to St. Peter. "Is it true," inquired the King of Colman, "that the keys of Heaven were given to St. Peter?" Colman admitted that it was true. "Then," replied the King, "I will not oppose the door-keeper of Heaven, lest when I present myself I find no one to open the door."

Thus the Easter controversy was settled. It was a foregone conclusion; the Queen and her son were Romans, Oswy himself was indifferent; and Wilfrid out-shone Colman in ability. But the Council of Whitby was one of the greatest consequence, not only to the Church, but also to Britain itself. Thenceforward there was one Communion of the Church; and this oneness of the national Church led to the oneness in later times of the Nation of the English.

But the decision of the Council led to a schism. Several of

the Celtic party, and amongst them Cedd, Eata, and Cuthbert, went over to the Roman usage ; but Colman resigned the See of Lindisfarne, and together with the larger number of the Scotch monks retired to Iona. Tuda then became the first Roman Bishop of Lindisfarne.

In the same year as the Council of Whitby, a severe pestilence carried off, amongst others, Earconbert, King of Kent, Frithona or Deusdedit, who had, A.D. 655, succeeded Honorius in the See of Canterbury, Cedd, Bishop of London, and Tuda, the lately appointed Bishop of Lindisfarne. Wilfrid succeeded Tuda and transferred the See from Lindisfarne to York. But as the See of Canterbury was vacant and there were not in Britain three Bishops whom he considered canonically consecrated, he crossed the sea and was ordained by Agilbert, the late Bishop of Dorchester, who had been translated to the Archbishopric of Paris. But Wilfrid was so honourably treated on the Continent, that he was in no hurry to return to Britain, and when he did so (A.D. 666), he found that he had through his delay incurred the displeasure of King Oswy, and that he was superseded at York by Chad, Abbot of Lastingham, and brother of the late Bishop Cedd of London.

But now another very important event both to the Church and Nation occurred. After the See of Canterbury had been vacant two years, the two leading Kings in Britain, Oswy, and Egbert who had succeeded Earconbert as King of Kent, chose as Archbishop a Kentish Priest named Wighard ; and as there was no Metropolitan in Britain, they despatched him to Rome to be consecrated by Pope Vitalian. Wighard, however, died in Rome. Whereupon the Pope (as it would appear by the request of Oswy), himself proceeded to appoint the Archbishop ; and having first nominated Hadrian, a monk from a monastery near Monte Casino, who refused the appointment, he appointed and consecrated Theodore, a monk (like Saul, of Tarsus in Cilicia), a hale old man of sixty-six years of age, and of great learning,

and deputed Hadrian and Benedict Biscop to accompany him to Britain.

A more judicious appointment could not have been made. He was a Greek, and therefore not unacceptable to the Celtic party, whilst his appointment by the Pope would render him acceptable to the Roman party. Theodore arrived in Britain in May, A.D. 669.

Theodore, who was a strong disciplinarian in the Roman interest, insisted on the carrying out of the decision of the Council of Whitby. He soon started on a general visitation of the English kingdoms. Arriving in Northumbria he detected a flaw in Chad's consecration. The See of Canterbury being vacant, Chad had been consecrated by Wini, Bishop of Winchester, assisted by two Celtic Bishops. Chad was consequently deposed, and Wilfrid reinstated. But Theodore was so struck with the gentleness and humility of Chad's character, that, having supplied the defect in his Orders, he obtained for him from Wulfhere, king of Mercia, the See of Lichfield. St. Chad, after holding the See three years, died on March 2, A.D. 672, a day commemorated as a *black letter day* in the Calendar; his name is still venerated in Lichfield, where the cathedral is dedicated to his memory.

Wilfrid soon got into trouble at York. Oswy was on his death (A.D. 670) succeeded in the kingdom of Northumbria by his son Egfrith, to whom together with his Queen, Wilfrid, partly through his own injudicious conduct, managed to give offence. Theodore, who perhaps felt some jealousy of Wilfrid, and thought he was laying the foundation of the independence of York, first divided his diocese and afterwards deposed him.

Wilfrid was not a man of Chad's gentle disposition. Smarting under the treatment he experienced from Theodore, and over-estimating the Pope in Britain, he took an unprecedented course, which afforded an unfortunate precedent, and started for Rome to lay his cause before the Pope. Being driven by contrary

winds on to the coast of Friesland, the land beyond the Zuyder See, he employed the time during which he was detained there in sowing the seeds of Christianity amongst the wild Friesland-ers.

Arrived at length at Rome he attended a Council, at which fifty Bishops met, in the Lateran Basilica, when judgment was given in his favour. Elated with his success he returned, A.D. 680, to England, the bearer of a letter to which the Papal *bull* (hence Papal letters were called *Bulls*), or seal, was attached, ordering Theodore to reinstate him at York and to attend the Council to be held at Constantinople. Theodore did neither; the Witenagemot, or council of *wise men*, held under the king, determined that Wilfrid's appeal to Rome constituted a further offence, and committed him to prison, where he remained nine months. After his release, being banished from Northumbria, he sought an asylum first in Mercia, and afterwards in Wessex, in both which kingdoms the relentless animosity of the King and Queen of Northumbria pursued him. He then sought and found (A.D. 681) a refuge in Sussex, where the King and Queen had already been converted to the Faith.

In Sussex a small monastery seems to have already existed at Bosham, but its services were confined to the inmates, and made no impression on the neighbouring country. When Wilfrid arrived in Sussex the country was afflicted with a sore famine, no rain having fallen for three years, and the people were reduced to such misery, that in gangs of forty or fifty they threw themselves from the rocks into the sea. Wilfrid taught them the art, which they so much needed, of deep-sea fishing, and thus gained their affections, so that they the more readily listened to and accepted the Gospel which he preached to them. Selsey became and remained the See of the Bishopric till the Norman Conquest, when it was transferred to Chichester.

Thus by the conversion of Sussex, the conversion of our English forefathers was completed. It spread over a period of

more than eighty years. It was effected by two distinct missions, the Roman and the Celtic. To sum up briefly the result. Kent was converted by St. Augustine (A.D. 597). East Anglia (A.D. 630), (through a combination of both missions) by a Burgundian monk named Felix, and an Irish monk named Fursey. Wessex by Birinus, sent over by Pope Honorius, (A.D. 634). Northumbria, temporally by a Canterbury mission under Paulinus, permanently by Scottish missionaries (A.D. 635). Mercia under the Scots (A.D. 653). Essex under Cedd, who was consecrated by Scotch Bishops (A.D. 654). Sussex by Wilfrid (A.D. 681).

Theodore, says Bede, "was the first Archbishop to whom the whole Church of England submitted." When Theodore first came to Britain, it appeared that there would be as many distinct and independent Churches as there were kingdoms in the Heptarchy. The Church consisted of little more than a number of disjointed and independent mission-stations. There were no resident Clergy amongst the people, the Priests and Monks issuing forth from the *monasterium*, or Bishop's house, to evangelise the neighbouring country. The Bishop was the royal Chaplain, the King at his own expense building a cathedral for the Diocese. Besides this there were no churches, Crosses being set up here and there, where the Missionaries preached and said Mass. The Primate of Canterbury was little more than a Diocesan Bishop, whose presence was confined to his own Diocese. In the general visitation of the kingdom which Theodore undertook, and which lasted three years, his object was to assert the position of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to organise and group the various Sees under one Metropolitan. The English Churches which at the Council of Whitby became one in rite, were made one in discipline by Theodore.

The first Provincial Synod was held under him at Hertford on September 24, A.D. 673, at which all the Bishops except

Wilfrid were present. At this Council, which was the first of our national assemblies, a body of Canon Law was drawn up. On September 15, A.D. 680, Theodore convened a Synod at Hatfield to enquire into the Faith of the British Church with regard to the Monothelite heresy. The Church was declared to be orthodox, and the decrees of the General Councils were accepted.

If others founded Churches, Theodore organised them into one National Church. So that the National Church of England has existed for more than twelve centuries. Soon after his death we find the Witan undertaking the protection of the Church in its temporalities. Under him an important advance was made in the Services and Ritual of the Church; Church music was cultivated, and Church architecture developed by Wilfrid and Benedict Biscop. The latter in one of the several journeys which he took to Rome brought thence John, the arch-chanter and Abbot of St. Martin's, by whom the northern Clergy were instructed in the Gregorian chants and matters of Ritual. Biscop was the founder of the famous monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow, the latter ever memorable as the abode of the *Venerable Bede*.

He also increased the number of Bishops from some seven or eight to nineteen, and confined the Bishops to their own Dioceses (*parochiæ*). He paved the way for the later division into Parishes, by giving the Nobles and great Landowners the right of patronage; they were thus led to build and endow churches on their estates for their families and their dependants, securing thereby more regular services than they had hitherto obtained from the occasional visits of itinerant clergymen. Thus arose the endowments of the Church of England, which were from time to time increased by the piety, and in some cases the superstitions, of the donors; but they were given for the Catholic Church; and thus the property of the Church of England is older than any other kind of property in the land.

Another mode of providing for the Church-services was by tithe, a method of payment existing, as has been already stated, under the Old Testament dispensation[†], the payment of which goes back to the earliest origin of the Church of England. The custom, says Sir William Blackstone, was "possibly contemporary with the planting of Christianity amongst the Saxons by St. Augustine." But no regulation existed in Britain as to whom the tithe was payable. Tithes were at first paid to whatever Church or Bishops the tithe-payer preferred; but Theodore induced the landlords to pay their tithes to their own Parish and their own Priest. The payment was at first voluntary, but in time landowners made it by their wills a charge on their property, and their estates descended to their heirs with the charge upon them. The payment of tithes became so general, that it was presumed by the Common Law to be payable, unless evidence could be produced to the contrary.

Under Theodore, *the Philosopher*, as he was styled, the Learning which had been banished from the country by the English Conquest was brought back, and the National Church became pre-eminently a learned Church, so that afterwards, when Learning was at its lowest ebb on the Continent, it was at its height in England, and lasted on till the Danish invasions. Benedict Biscop was a man not inferior in learning to Theodore himself. Their no less gifted friend Hadrian was, Bede says, "exceedingly skilled in Greek and Latin; a fountain of letters and a river of art;" and again Bede says that the scholars of Theodore and Hadrian were equally well versed in Greek and Latin, as in their own language.

The monasteries became under Theodore places of both secular and religious education for men and women. Libraries were founded which were celebrated over the Continent; the library founded by St. Augustine at Canterbury was added to; and one, especially famous, was founded by Wilfrid at York.

[†] See p. 159.

Conspicuous in learning beyond all others was the *Venerable* Bede (673—734); in whom, says Mr. Green, “the whole learning of the age seems to be summed up.” Born on the site where Benedict Biscop one year later founded the monastery of Wearmouth, and being left an orphan at seven years of age, he was committed to the care of Benedict Biscop, by whom he was transferred to Jarrow, when, A.D. 682, the latter built that neighbouring monastery. He was ordained Deacon at the age of nineteen, and at thirty, Priest, by John of Beverley, who was at that time Bishop of Hexham. He spent the whole remainder of his life in the Monastery of Jarrow, devoting himself to the study of the Scriptures and the Fathers; he was thus enabled to produce his “*Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*,” which, with the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (a work also due to the diligence of the monks, and in which England has such a record of its early history as no other nation possesses) is the chief, and almost the sole, authority for the early history of our Church.

Theodore died A.D. 690. Wilfrid had been before restored to his Diocese of York, but he again got into trouble under Theodore’s successor, Brightwald (693—731). Again he appealed to Rome; this new appeal was pronounced, in a Council at Easterfield in Yorkshire, to be contumacious, and he was deposed and excommunicated; and so strong was the detestation of one who appealed to a foreign jurisdiction, that nobody would eat in his company; food blessed by him was thrown away; the sacred vessels which he had used in Church were deemed polluted.

Once more the old man, verging now on seventy years of age, bent his way to Rome. Again the matter was decided in his favour, but with no greater success than before. The King of Northumbria refused to alter a decision pronounced by himself and the Archbishop, “for any writings coming, as you call it, from the Apostolical See.” But every one was now wearied with the interminable struggle. The Archbishop convened another Synod at Nidd, near Knaresborough, which was attended by the

King and the dignitaries of the realm. All the Bishops present sided against Wilfrid. But ultimately a compromise was effected. The Papal decree was not accepted, and Wilfrid was not restored to the See of York, although it was vacant by the death of the late Bishop. To that See the sainted John of Beverley was appointed, Wilfrid succeeding him in the See of Hexham. He ended his stormy life in the monastery of Oundle, A.D. 709.

CHAPTER IX.

MAHOMETANISM.

BONIFACE III. accepts the title of Universal Bishop—The Emperor Heraclius—Conquest of Jerusalem by the Persians—The Exaltation of the Holy Cross—Life of Mahomet—The Koran—Islam—The Saracens—The Hegira—Death of Mahomet—The Caliphs—Conquest of Jerusalem by the Mahometans—The Patriarch Sophronius—Conquest of Palestine—The Jacobites, or Copts—Fall of Alexandria—Of Carthage—The Patriarchates of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, become little more than titular—Failure of the Saracens to capture Constantinople—Their Conquest of Spain—First Mahometan Settlement in India—Polygamy and Slavery perpetuated in the East through the Saracens—Dissensions amongst the Christians—The Monothelite Heresy—Held by Pope Honorius I.—The Ecthesis—The Type of Faith—Martin I., Pope—The Third Council of Constantinople—It anathematizes the late Pope Honorius—Honorius anathematized by succeeding Popes—The Quinsext Council—Anathematizes Honorius—The Apostolical Canons and Constitutions—Summary of the Six General Councils—The Three Creeds.

THE favours which the tyrant Phocas conferred with so liberal a hand on the Western Patriarchate, did not cease with the death of Gregory the Great. After the short Pontificate of his unworthy successor, Sabinianus (604—606), a person, says Platina, “of mean birth and meaner reputation,” Boniface III. (607), and Boniface IV. (607—615), followed as Popes of Rome.

Phocas in order to humiliate his own Patriarch Cyriacus, against whom it has been already stated he had a grudge, decreed that the Roman Church should be the Head of all Churches; and Boniface III. did not scruple to accept the exclusive prerogative of Œcumenical Bishop, which Gregory had denounced as a mark of Antichrist, and blasphemous.

Boniface IV. converted (A.D. 608) the Pantheon at Rome, (which, again to quote Platina, he received from Phocas), into a Christian Church, which is now called St. Maria Rotunda, dedicating it to St. Mary and the Martyrs.

The usurper Phocas reaped as he had sown. Chosroes II.,

King of Persia, who when driven from his kingdom had found an asylum in Roman territories, owed a debt of gratitude to Maurice for his restoration to his throne. To avenge the murder of his benefactor, Chosroes (A.D. 603) invaded the Roman Provinces, and began a war which lasted for more than twenty years. Phocas, who did nothing to repel the invasion, was condemned by all as disgracing the throne of Constantinople; and every Province in the Empire was ripe for rebellion. Stripped of the Imperial ensigns and loaded with chains, he was carried before Heraclius the Exarch of Africa, before whom he was accused of the crimes and misgovernment of eight years, and after suffering every kind of insult and torture, was dethroned and beheaded. Heraclius (610—641), was then, by the common voice of the Senate, Clergy, and people, elected Emperor, and it appeared that under him the Empire, which, with a short interval under Maurice, had suffered under the uninterrupted ravages of the Persians, would recover much of its ancient glory.

When Heraclius came to the throne, the Empire was suffering from the crimes of Phocas, and the Persians were carrying all before them. Chosroes having recruited his army with twenty-six thousand Jews, who from their hatred to Christianity were willing to join his standard, effected, A.D. 614, the conquest of Jerusalem. The Holy Places were defiled; the Churches built by Constantine and Helena were burnt; and the Patriarch, Zachariah, together with the true Cross, said to have been discovered by Helena, were carried off to Persia; whilst the massacre of ninety-thousand Christians is imputed to the Jews and Arabs. For ten years (617—627) the Persians were masters of Egypt; and they were encamped in view of the Palace of Constantinople. By a series of brilliant victories Heraclius turned the tide of war, recovered the Provinces taken by the Persians, and penetrated into Persia itself. After a last victory (A.D. 628), a treaty of peace was concluded between the two Empires; the Holy Cross was reclaimed, and in the following year restored to the Holy

Sepulchre, Heraclius himself proceeding on a Pilgrimage to Jerusalem for the purpose. The event was afterwards commemorated in an annual Festival, on September 14, the *Exaltation of the Holy Cross*.

From the blows inflicted on it by Heraclius, the Persian Empire never recovered. At the beginning of the Seventh Century arose the deadliest foe that Christianity ever encountered; under it the Persian Empire speedily succumbed; and at the very time that Christianity was making rapid advances in Britain, it had to fight for its very existence in the East; and a new religion was established in the world.

The history of Mahomet's life scarcely comes within the province of a history of the Christian Church, and the ravages which Mahometanism inflicted on the Christian world arose after his death. But the life of a man who originated a religion which has exercised so wonderful an influence on the human race, and which in the present day numbers one hundred million adherents, is one of more than passing interest to the Church.

The fatherland of Mahometanism was Arabia, a country from which such a foe to Christianity was to be least expected, and which had occupied but a small part in the world's history. Mahomet (whether this or Mohammed is the more correct form, is of little consequence), the son of Abdallah and Amina, was born, A.D. 570, at Mecca, near the Red Sea. He was a scion of the noble family of Haslem in Arabia, and of the most illustrious of its tribes, the Koreish, the hereditary guardians of the Caaba, (the ancient sanctuary of Mecca,) which attracted to it a large number of annual pilgrims long before the time of Mahomet. Mecca, which now reckons only forty-five thousand, in its prosperous days numbered one hundred thousand inhabitants. Left an orphan in his sixth year in straitened circumstances, he raised himself, when twenty-four years of age, to an important position, by a marriage with a rich and high-born widow, named Khadijah, fifteen years older than

himself, whose mercantile affairs he had previously managed. Her father opposed the marriage, but Mahomet managed to keep him in a state of intoxication till the ceremony was performed, and he continued faithful to her till her death, A.D. 619. By her he became the father of six children, all of whom, except his daughter Fatima, died young.

He is described as a man of medium size, but handsome countenance and commanding presence, and withal sociable and affable manners even with the poorest citizens of Mecca. Moreover he had (as we could judge, even if we were not told) a lively imagination, as well as a genius for poetry and religion. But his education had been so neglected, that he was perfectly illiterate, and it was questioned by his followers whether he could even read or write. He was also through life, from his fourth year, afflicted with epileptic convulsions, which he himself, as well as his enemies, at first attributed to demoniacal possessions, but which were afterwards attributed by his adherents to the working of God.

In his fortieth year (A.D. 610) he entered upon his religious career, announcing himself as the apostle of God, sent to root out idolatry, and to restore the true faith of the preceding prophets, who were his forerunners: Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus.

The Koran, which, with his revelations, contains the creed and code of the civil and religious laws of the Mahometans, was revealed to him by the Arch-Angel Gabriel, who as he had been the Messenger of God under the Jewish dispensation, was now sent by Him for a higher purpose; and the message was dictated by Mahomet, under inspiration, to his disciples, who committed it to writing. It speaks of the Bible as "the Word of God," and mentions many of the leading events in the Old, as well as St. John the Baptist, the Virgin Mary, and Jesus, Who is spoken of as "the Messiah Jesus, the blessed Son of Mary," in the New Testament. Jesus was a Prophet, like himself,

born miraculously and working miracles. Mahomet believed also in Christ's Second Advent, His triumph over Antichrist, and in a Millennium ; but Christ was not the Son of God, nor the Saviour of the world, nor so great a Prophet as himself.

Mahomet worked no miracles ; in the Koran he expressly disclaims the power, and when asked by his disciples to perform miracles, like Jesus, appealed to the internal evidence of his teaching as a surer proof of his mission ; miracles, he said, could only obscure the truth.

His faith he termed Islam, or Resignation to the Will of God, from which the name Moslem (one who resigns himself, to the Will of God) is derived. His followers also were styled Saracens, of which the derivation is uncertain, some referring it to Sarah, the wife of Abraham, as implying that the followers of Mahomet were the only heirs of the divine promises. A more probable derivation is from an Arab word, *Sharkæa* ; *Sharkæans* (Eastern people) being rendered by the Greeks, *Σαρακένοι* (Saracens).

He rejected the false gods of Arabia, and the worship of images and idols ; "there is one God and Mahomet is his prophet" was his message, and to the One God the Koran bears noble testimony.

We need not enter into the question whether he was an enthusiast or an impostor. At one time it was the fashion to assail him with every opprobrious epithet ; of recent years the estimate of him and the Koran has veered round to the opposite, and probably equally erroneous, extreme. If we may hazard an opinion, it would be that he began his career as the first, and ended it as the last. The revelation from Gabriel might be the result of a naturally sensitive imagination, which a constitution weakened by a life-long epilepsy would have increased. When he began his career, merely as a prophet of Arabia, with the view of extirpating idolatry, and recognised Christianity as a religion co-ordinate with his own, and ex-

horted his followers to reverence Christ, he did not go beyond many other enthusiasts ; he was a deceiver, but not necessarily an impostor. But when he pretended that he was the foretold Prophet of the whole world, and claimed the universe as his sphere, and tried to force his religion at the point of the sword ; and when he preached Polygamy as a divinely revealed institution, and limiting others to four wives, claimed seventeen for himself ; it seems impossible to acquit him of sensuality and imposture.

When first he received his call from Gabriel to "cry in the name of the Lord," he trembled as if something dreadful had happened to him, and even contemplated suicide. But Gabriel told him, "I am Gabriel, and thou the Prophet of God ; fear not." He began his mission in his native city. By slow degrees a few converts joined him, amongst the first being his wife Khadijah, his father-in-law, and the young Omar. In three years he had only made fourteen, and in seven years about a hundred, disciples. But he stirred up much opposition amongst the families of his own tribe, the Koreish, and being warned by an angel that his life was in danger, he, on July 16, A.D. 622, fled to Medina, a city two hundred and fifty miles distant from Mecca, where he made a public entrance, and such homage as is due to a prince was accorded him.

From this flight, known as the Hegira, the Mahometans date the commencement of their Era. The character of his mission quickly underwent a change. As he had been unjustly driven out from Mecca, the day of persuasion was ended. He declared that he had received a divine commission to establish his religion by force of arms, and to extirpate the infidels ; and the preacher of peace was now converted into a warrior. He who had begun as the prophet of Arabia, now proclaimed himself the prophet of the world. As the spiritual exhortations of the prophet had been rejected, it was the duty of his followers to wage carnal war against the unbelievers. The duty of fighting for Islam was the duty of all who could bear

arms ; his followers were urged forward by a fanatical impulse, that the day of each man's death was immutably fixed, and when that day came, if he did not die on the field of battle, yet die he must. This feeling Mahomet worked upon by the temporal inducement of rapine and sensual gratification ; whilst an eternal reward in heaven was also promised to those who fell in battle ; " The sword," he said, " was the key of Heaven and Hell ; whosoever falls in battle in the cause of Allah, his sins are forgiven, and at the day of judgment his limbs will be enveloped by the wings of Angels and Cherubims ! "

There was much in the circumstances of the time to promote the advance of Islam. The condition of Arabia, which was broken up into a number of different sects, none of which was able singly to withstand him, was favourable to Mahomet. Not less favourable was the state of the Christian world, which was such as to provoke the judgments which fell upon it. It was the time when Christianity was distracted by the strife of words, and the controversies of the Nestorians and Eutychians in the East as to the Nature of our Lord, as well as by the hostility of the Donatists in Africa. With these divergent sects of Christianity, Islam had one thing only in common, the doctrine of One God ; and although Mahomet was regarded by one and all of them as Antichrist, and his followers stigmatised as Infidels, yet in their hatred to orthodox Christianity, they hailed the Infidels as deliverers from a heavy burden, and joined their ranks against their brother Christians.

Without the force of arms and the aid of such allies amongst the Christians, Mahomet would probably have failed, as so many pretenders have failed both before and after him. In January, A.D. 624, he, by angelic aid, as stated in the Koran, gained the victory of Beder over the Koreish ; in the same year he lost, through disobedience of his orders, the battle of Ohud, six miles from Medina. Thenceforward no toleration was to be offered to the Unbelievers, except by submission to the Koran and the

payment of tribute. In 628 he was strong enough to treat as their equal, not only with the Princes of Arabia, but with others beyond its limits. He sent a letter to Chosroes, King of Persia, inviting him to embrace Islamism, and to accept him as the Prophet of God ; and when he was informed that Chosroes had torn the letter in pieces, he exclaimed, "It is thus that God will tear the kingdom and reject the supplications of Chosroes." Another letter to the same effect he addressed to Heraclius, when he was at Emesa, on his triumphal return from the Persian war ; Heraclius is said to have received it with respect, and the Arabians, from that circumstance, ever afterwards claimed the conversion of the Christian Emperor to their Faith.

In 626 Mahomet began to advocate and preach the practice of Polygamy, in favour of which he adduced divine authority. He himself set the example with taking, notwithstanding the misery which he is said to have experienced from them, seventeen wives.

In 629 he entered Mecca as a conqueror, whence he had been before driven in peril of his life, and destroyed three hundred and sixty idols of the Caaba. Here he proclaimed his mission, "There is One God, and Mahomet is His Prophet." The conquest of Mecca determined the faith of Arabia ; many of his principal adversaries became proselytes to his faith, and all the tribes of Arabia swore allegiance to him. Mecca now became the Capital of Islam.

Meanwhile, after a series of triumphant campaigns (622—628), the Emperor Heraclius had conquered Persia, and peace was concluded between the two Empires, A.D. 628. In the next year (as we have already seen) Heraclius went on his pilgrimage to Jerusalem. On June 7, A.D. 632, Mahomet died in his sixty-third year, at Medina, and was there buried. His successors, of whom his father-in-law, Abu-Bakr, was the first, were called Caliphs (a word meaning successors). In the same year, when only four years had elapsed since the termination of their more

than twenty years internecine struggle, the two great potentates of the world, the Persian and Byzantine Empires, were invaded by the Saracens.

For a short time after the death of Mahomet the expedition was stopped, and the army of the Saracens, out of respect to their late Prophet, halted at the gates of Medina. Abu-Bakr wrote to the tribes of Arabia that the true believers were about to invade Syria to take it out of the hands of the Infidels; and that the war for religion was an act of obedience to God. The war was soon renewed, and that with Persia (632—651) only ended in the conquest of the whole kingdom, in the destruction of the monarchy, and the extinction of Persia as a political power. The Dynasty which had reigned in Persia since the time of Artaxerxes came to an end, and Persia gradually became a Mahometan power.

The war with the Roman Empire, and the conquest of Syria by the Saracens, inflicted a disastrous blow on Christianity. After his pilgrimage to Jerusalem was ended, the Emperor Heraclius does not appear to have returned to Constantinople, but to have remained at Antioch to arrange the affairs of the Eastern Provinces of the Empire. A severe bodily illness from which he suffered at this period of his life, is sufficient to account for his not taking the field in person against the Saracenic invaders. Deprived of his leadership, the Roman armies, which had lately achieved such signal victories over the Persians, seem to have been paralysed under the suddenness and impetuosity of the attacks of the Saracens. In 633 Bozra fell, betrayed by the treachery and apostasy of the Governour, Romanus. In 635, Damascus, the capital of Syria, a four days' journey from Bozra, after a siege of seventy days, capitulated. In the same year Heliopolis and Emesa fell. In 637 Jerusalem, which had been considered by Mahomet a city sacred next to Mecca and Medina, fell after a siege of four months, and, except for a short time during the Crusades, the Holy Places have since

remained in the hands of the Infidels. In 638 Aleppo and Antioch succumbed to Kaled, the *Sword of God*.

The surrender of Jerusalem was negotiated through the Caliph Omar, the successor of Abu-Bakr, and the Patriarch Sophronius. Sophronius was compelled to indicate to the conqueror the Holy Places and the site of the Temple. There Omar built the stately Mosque, known as the Mosque of Omar. From Jerusalem the Saracens marched to Phœnicia; Tripolis and Tyre were betrayed to them. Cæsarea, the metropolis of Syria, deserted by Constantine, the eldest son of Heraclius, who found himself unable to withstand the troops of the Caliph, surrendered without a blow; the remainder of Palestine followed the example of the capital. Thus Syria was conquered, and the Holy Land wrested from Christendom, and Christianity was thenceforward only tolerated as an appendage to Mahometanism. The Christian Churches were to afford free access to the Mussulmans; no outward symbols were allowed to stand to offend their feelings; no Cross to be exhibited on the buildings; no bells to announce the Christian Services; the monasteries were allowed to stand only on condition of their affording to Mahometans the same shelter, free of cost, which they gave to the Christians. Well might the Patriarch Sophronius exclaim in the bitterness of his soul, "Now is the abomination of desolation to be seen in the Holy of Holies."

The conquest of Palestine effected, the Mussulmans next, under Amrou, invaded Egypt (A.D. 638). Here, in the interior of the country, they found powerful allies in the Monophysite Jacobites or Copts, who hailed the Saracens as their deliverers. The Jacobites, who composed the greater part of the native population, hated the Greeks, who were Catholics, and adherents of the Council of Chalcedon. They chose submission to, and toleration under, Infidels, who entirely denied the Divinity of Christ, in order to avenge themselves on their fellow-Christians, who differed from them only as to the two Natures or One

Nature in the Saviour ; and through their means Egypt fell an easy prey to the arms of the Saracens.

During the siege of Memphis, the governour of the Province, in his own name and that of his brethren, told the Saracenic General that he wished to have no communion with the Greeks, either in this world or in the next ; that he abjured the Byzantine Tyrant, the Council of Chalcedon, and the Melchite slaves. He would not embrace the Mahometan faith, nor abandon the doctrine of Christ ; but he was willing to pay tribute and yield obedience to the Saracens.

But in the annals of the Saracenic conquests, the siege of Alexandria was the most arduous enterprise. Only after a siege of fourteen months, and after the Saracens had lost twenty-three thousand men, did the Capital of Egypt fall. The successful Amrou, says Gibbon, could boast that he had taken a City which contained four thousand palaces, four thousand baths, four hundred theatres, twelve thousand shops, four thousand shops for the sale of vegetable food, and forty thousand tributary Jews.

The Emperor Heraclius lived long enough to hear of the fall of Alexandria, and the destruction (the truth of which, however, has been called in question) made, it was said, by order of the Caliph Omar, of the famous library of Alexandria founded by the Ptolemies. The death of Heraclius occurred about seven weeks after the conquest ; his reign once promised to be one of the most glorious of the Roman Emperors ; but he lived long enough to see all his hopes exterminated ; the conquests he had made from the Persians torn away by the Saracens, and the Roman Empire shorn of its dominions in Syria and Egypt.

The conquest of Africa was intermitted from time to time through dissensions which had now grown up amongst the Saracens, and it was more than half a century (647—698) before Carthage was taken and destroyed. But in 698, the Metropolis of Africa fell ; thus the country of SS. Cyprian and Augustine was lost to Christianity ; the Christian Church in North Africa

ceased to exist, and its four or five hundred Bishoprics were exterminated.

Before the end of the century in which Mahomet died, his followers had conquered Syria and the Holy Land, Egypt, Persia, parts of Asia, and all the North of Africa. The Patriarchates of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch had become little more than a name, and the Roman Empire in the East was confined to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Twice (A.D. 673 and 716) the Saracens besieged Constantinople; but the fortifications of the city, and the newly-invented Greek fire which was poured upon them, proved too strong, and fatal to the invaders; and the Saracens were compelled to purchase peace by the payment of an annual tribute. Thus the Patriarch of Constantinople was saved the fate of his brother Patriarchs in the East, and it was not till A.D. 1453 that Constantinople fell under the arms of the victorious Turks.

In 711 the Arabs and the Moors, who had embraced Mahometanism, invited into Spain by the treachery of the Governour of Ceuta, crossed the Straits of Gibraltar, and defeated in a battle near Xeres, Roderic, King of the Goths, who in his flight was drowned in the waters of the Guadalquiver. The conquest of Spain was effected in about three years, after which it capitulated, the people being allowed, on payment of a heavy tribute to the conquerors, to follow their own religion. From Spain the Saracens crossed the Pyrenees, and were enabled to settle for a time in the South of Gaul, threatening to make all Gaul, and with it the whole of the West, their own, and boasting that they would stable their horses in St. Peter's at Rome. From this, however, they were diverted, and, as we shall see presently, their further conquests Westward were arrested by Charles Martel, and they were again driven back beyond the Pyrenees.

The same year which witnessed the overthrow of Roderic, witnessed also the conquest of Scinde and the first Mahometan settlement in India. Scinde, however, was reconquered A.D. 750,

and the conquest of India was not again undertaken by the Mahometans till the close of the Tenth Century, when they invaded Hindostan, and nearly all India became after a time subjected to Mahometan rule.

Whatever may be said in favour of Islam and the Koran, the undeniable fact remains, that it is owing to the Mahometans that two of the greatest curses which ever afflicted the world have been perpetuated in the East, Polygamy and Slavery.

From the havoc inflicted on the Church by the followers of Mahomet, we must return to the dissensions which existed amongst the Christians themselves. In the early part of the Seventh Century a new heresy, arising out of that of the Monophysites, sprung up in the Eastern Church. This, although the name was not applied to them till the following century, was the heresy of the Monothelites (*μόνον θέλημα*, one Will), who taught that there was only one Will in the Saviour. From the Oneness of His Person they deduced the Oneness of his Will, the divine Will controlling the Humanity. The doctrine was taught about A.D. 616, by Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Cyrus, Bishop of Phasis, who, A.D. 630, was translated by the Emperor Heraclius, himself a favourer of the doctrine, to the Patriarchate of Alexandria. In a Council of Alexandria, held under Cyrus, nine Articles were agreed to, in the seventh of which it was stated that our Lord performed divine and human actions by one Theandric, or divine-human, operation (*μὴ Θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ*).

Sophronius, a monk of Palestine, who happened to be at Alexandria at the time, was the first to expose the heresy, and proceeding to Constantinople he implored Sergius not to countenance such an Apollinarian doctrine. Sophronius was, A.D. 634, appointed to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem^a.

Sergius, alarmed by the promotion of Sophronius, endeavoured to enlist Honorius I., Pope of Rome (625—638), on his side,

^a See p. 318.

and addressed to him a letter on the subject. The Pope in his answer signified his agreement with Sergius; "We confess," he said, "One Will in our Lord Jesus Christ," (*unam voluntatem fatemur Domini nostri Jesu Christi*).

The Emperor thinking that he had discovered a means of healing the dissensions between the Monophysites or Jacobites and the orthodox, acting under the influence of Sergius, issued (A.D. 639) an edict, probably composed by Sergius himself, called the *Ecthesis* or *Exposition of Faith*, which declared that one Will was to be confessed as agreeable with the teaching of the early Fathers, and forbade all discussion as to the one or two Wills. The Patriarchs of Alexandria and Constantinople accepted the Ecthesis, whilst the Patriarch of Jerusalem was prevented by the troubles from the Saracens which overwhelmed his Patriarchate, from taking further part in the controversy.

Honorius was now dead, and the Ecthesis, which had already been condemned in a Council at Rome (A.D. 639), found an opponent in John IV. (640—642), his next successor but one in the Papacy. Thereupon Heraclius wrote to the Pope disavowing all responsibility for the Ecthesis and attributing it to the now deceased Sergius.

Heraclius died A.D. 641. Pyrrhus, who succeeded Sergius, at first held the heresy; he was for a time converted from it by Maximus a monk, or rather Abbot, but afterwards relapsed into it. Paul (A.D. 642), the successor of Pyrrhus, was also a Monothelite. Maximus, one of the most eminent writers of the day, became, after the death of Sophronius, the able opponent of Monothelitism, and the advocate of the Orthodox Doctrine, in the African Church.

The Emperor Constans II. (641—668) withdrew the Ecthesis, and, A.D. 648, replaced it by another edict, composed by Paul, called the *Type of Faith* (*Τύπος τῆς Πιστέως*), with the object of stopping the use of the objectionable words, and forbidding all disputations on the subject. But this negative proceeding did

not meet with approval at Rome, and Theodore I. (642—649), who had succeeded John as Pope, after a Council at Rome excommunicated Paul.

Pope Martin I. (649—654) was equally opposed to the decree of the Emperor. In the year of his accession he held the First Lateran Council at Rome, which, attended by one hundred and five Bishops, declared that there were in the Saviour Two Natural Wills and operations, the Divine and the Human, and condemned the heresy of the Monothelites, anathematising Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria, and Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul, Patriarchs of Constantinople. The Council denounced the expression “one Theandric operation,” as well as the Ecthesis and Type, as “most impious.”

Constans, who regarded the proceedings of the Council with the greatest indignation, sent his agents to Rome, who seizing Martin, conveyed him, in September 653, with much cruelty, as a common criminal to Constantinople. After being detained a prisoner for six months at Constantinople, and only saved from the punishment of death by the intervention of Paul, he was banished to Cherson, where in the same year, after suffering from want of the bare necessities of life, he died. Maximus and several Bishops who refused to accept the Type were banished, and subjected to similar cruelty.

The Monothelite controversy having smouldered for awhile under the two successors of Martin, Eugenius I. (654—657), and Vitalian (657—672), who showed no opposition to, even if they did not countenance the heresy, broke out again in the Pontificate of Adeodatus (672—676), who again broke off communion with Constantinople. It continued through the Pontificate of Donus (676—678), till the Emperor Constantine IV. (668—685), surnamed Pogonatus or the *Bearded*, determined by the advice of Agatho the new Pope (678—681) to summon a General Council with the view of extirpating the schism.

The Sixth General Council, or Third of Constantinople,

(680—681), accordingly met under the presidency of the Emperor in a room of the Imperial palace, called from its vaulted roof, *Trullus*. It was attended by the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch, and by somewhat more than two hundred Bishops (the exact number is variously given), amongst whom were legates representing the Patriarch of Rome, with Priests to represent those of Alexandria and Jerusalem. Agatho summoned Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, to attend the Council; the Archbishop did not obey the summons, but in order to show the freedom of the English Church from the Monothelite heresy, himself held the Council of Hatfield^b.

The Sixth Council held eighteen Sessions, which were marked by proceedings of order and decency not always observed in previous Councils. The Monothelites were condemned unanimously, except by Macarius, Bishop of Antioch, who was thereupon sentenced to deposition. The Council decreed that there were in the Saviour two Natural Wills and operations, not contrary to each other; without division, change, antagonism, or confusion; but that the Human could not come into collision with the Divine Will, to which it was in all things subject. The anathemas of the Council included Theodore, an Arabian Bishop, (who had originally brought over Sergius to his views), Sergius, and Pyrrhus, and other Monothelite leaders.

The Council also anathematised Honorius, the late Pope of Rome, as sanctioning the "impious" doctrines of Sergius (*Ὁνόριον τὸν γενόμενον Πάπαν τῆς Πρεσβυτέρας Ρώμης*). The fact that the Council anathematised Honorius can only be rejected by a denial of the Council itself. His heresy had been acknowledged by Pope John IV., who, however, palliated it on the ground that Honorius had only meant to deny two *contrariant* Natures in Christ. But Leo II. (682—683), the successor of Agatho, accepted and confirmed the decision of the Council, and expressly approved the condemnation of Honorius, in conjunction with others who were condemned as traitors to the

^b See p. 305.

Faith ("Anathematizamus . . . necnon et Honorium, qui hanc Apostolicam Ecclesiam, non Apostolicæ traditionis doctrinâ lustravit, sed profanâ traditione immaculatam subvertere conatus, est"). And succeeding Popes for three hundred years afterwards, on their accession, repeated the anathema.

It is impossible to reconcile the defection of Honorius, which even Roman Catholics do not deny, and his anathematisation by a General Council, with the doctrine of Papal Infallibility as decreed in the Vatican Council, A.D. 1870.

As no Canons with respect to Church discipline had been enacted in the Fifth and Sixth General Councils, another Council, as supplementary to them (hence called the Quinsext Council), was summoned (A.D. 691) by the Emperor Justinian II. (685—694; and again 705—711). It was also called the Council *in Trullo*, from its being held in the same vaulted room as the previous Council. All the Patriarchs (except the Roman), and about two hundred and thirty Bishops attended, and one hundred and two Canons were enacted.

Several of its Canons, notably VI. and XIII., which related to the marriage of the Clergy; XXXVI. and XXXVIII., with regard to the See of Constantinople; LXVII., respecting the eating of blood and things strangled; LXXXII., about representations of the Saviour, not as the Lamb of God, but in human form; being contrary to Roman customs and decrees, were rejected by the Roman Bishop, Sergius I. (687—701). Canon I. confirmed the Anathema pronounced by the Sixth General Council against Honorius; Canon II. declared the "Apostolical Canons" to be authoritative and binding, but rejects the "Apostolical Constitutions" as containing heretical teaching.

The Emperor, deeply offended by the opposition of the Pope to the Canons of the Council, ordered him to be seized and brought to Constantinople. But so hated was he for his vices that his agent was insulted and driven out of Rome, and was only

indebted for his life to the interposition of the Pope. Thus the Pope escaped through the unpopularity of Justinian II., who was soon afterwards deposed and banished ; he was, however (A.D. 705), restored, and continued to reign till A.D. 711.

Sergius was succeeded in the Pontificate of Rome by John VI. (701—705), and next to him followed John VII. (705—707). The Emperor ordered the latter Pope to receive the decrees of the Quinsext Council, and he was only saved from further humiliation by death. Sisinnius, the next Pope, who died twenty days after his election, was succeeded by Constantine I. (708—715). Justinian, who was still determined to enforce the decrees of the Council, summoned the Pope to Constantinople. The Pope went ; how far he yielded to the Emperor's commands is uncertain ; the Emperor, however, was gratified and conciliated, and the Pope was allowed to return to Rome.

The Quinsext Council, styling itself a General one, was commonly so regarded by the Greek Church, and Gratian accounts it as part of the Sixth General Council ; it was, however, repudiated by the Western Church, and thus another of the breaches between East and West was effected.

Mention was made in the Trullan Council of the Apostolical Canons and Apostolical Constitutions. The date of both is uncertain, for though in early times they were attributed to St. Clement of Rome, who was said to have committed them to writing from the mouths of the Apostles, that opinion has been disproved. Of these, the former, which were drawn partly from Scripture, partly from tradition and early Councils, were designed as a system of discipline for the Clergy. They were probably of gradual growth, collected into one body about the middle of the Fourth Century ; but the last canon, LXXXV., ascribes the entire work to the Apostles. The whole number of eighty-five was received as authoritative by the Eastern Church, although only the first fifty were accepted in the West.

Their authority, however, is superseded by the General Councils.

The Apostolical Constitutions, comprised in eight books, contain rules as to the Services of the Church, the Ministers, the Prayers and Psalmody, Fasts and Festivals, and the duty of the laity towards the Clergy. From internal evidence it has been concluded that they were compiled by some Eastern Bishop about the beginning of the Fourth Century. Epiphanius, who wrote in the first years of the Fifth Century, is the first to speak of them under their present title; he does not reckon them as the work of the Apostles, and states that some people doubted their genuineness.

In regard to the difference between the Eastern and Western Churches with respect to the marriage of the Clergy, it may be remarked that both the Canons and Constitutions sanction it. The Sixth Book of the Constitutions allows only a single marriage of the Clergy. The XXVIth Canon forbids the marriage of the Clergy after their Ordination. Canon VI. forbids a Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon, who is already married, to put away his wife "under pretence of religion;" if he do so, let him be separated (*ἀφορίζεσθω*) from Communion, "and deposed," (*καθαίρεισθω*). Canon XVIII. makes marriage with a widow, or a divorced person, or person of low character, a bar to Holy Orders.

As we have now arrived at the Sixth General Council, which is the last universally acknowledged to be a General Council, it may be useful to give a brief summary of the Six General Councils.

The First at Nice, A.D. ³25, summoned by the Emperor Constantine the Great, against Arius, decided that Christ is Very God of Very God, Begotten, not Made, of One Substance with the Father. In this Council the first part of the Nicene Creed was drawn up.

The Second Council, the First of Constantinople, A.D. 381,

was summoned by the Emperor Theodosius I., against the Macedonians who denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. Several clauses, and all the clauses following the words, "I believe in the Holy Ghost," were added to the Nicene Creed; and the Third Canon enacted that the See of Constantinople should rank second to that of Rome.

The Third Council at Ephesus, A.D. 431, was summoned by the Emperor, Theodosius II. ; it condemned Nestorius, and laid down the truth as expressed in the Athanasian Creed, that our Saviour, although "He be God and Man, is not two, but One Christ."

The Fourth Council at Chalcedon, A.D. 451, summoned by the Emperor Marcian, condemned Eutyches, and decided that "as the Reasonable Soul and Flesh is one man, so God and Man is One Christ," "not by confusion of Substance but by unity of Person." The Council also put the See of Constantinople on an equality with that of Rome, and raised the See of Jerusalem to the rank of a Patriarchate.

The Fifth Council, or Second of Constantinople, convened A.D. 553, by the Emperor Justinian I., condemned the writings of certain deceased Bishops which were supposed to savour of Nestorianism, and passed Canons confirming the decrees of the Four previous Councils.

The Sixth Council, or Third of Constantinople, A.D. 680, summoned by the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, condemned the Monophysite heresy, which taught that our Saviour had only one Nature; and it anathematised Honorius, Bishop of Rome, as guilty of that heresy.

A few words may here be added as to the Three Creeds, Symbols (*σύμβολα*, tokens), or Rules of Faith (*κάνονες*, *regule fidei*), which were the earliest forms of the oral traditions of the Church.

It is reasonable to suppose that in the very earliest times of the Christian Church, what our Saviour and His Apostles taught

would be summed up in a brief and succinct form, such as could be easily grasped and remembered by the faithful. The earliest of the Creeds was undoubtedly the Apostles' Creed, which many writers contended was drawn up by the Apostles themselves. This opinion, however, which is not older than the Fourth Century, is generally believed to be erroneous; the Creed probably derives its title from its containing the doctrines taught by the Apostles; which doctrines were in the earliest times committed in a catechetical form to the memory of candidates for Baptism, and not till a later date committed to writing.

The Nicene Creed, as above stated, was drawn up as far as the clause "And in the Holy Ghost" at the Council of Nice; several, and all the concluding clauses, being added at the First Council of Constantinople.

The Athanasian Creed, or *Quicunque Vult* (so called from its first words, *Quicunque vult salvus esse, whosoever wishes to be saved*) is probably not ascribable to St. Athanasius himself, but to some later writer, and is only called after his name because it embodies the doctrine of which he was the great champion and Confessor. Dr. Waterland thinks it is the work of St. Hilary, Archbishop of Arles, and that it was composed about A.D. 430. That it was not the work of St. Athanasius himself seems evident from the fact that it was originally written in Latin, whereas St. Athanasius wrote in Greek; it also distinctly upholds the double Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, which was an article of faith in the Western, but not in the Eastern Church.

CHAPTER X.

ICONOCLASM.

SIMPLICITY of the Services of the Early Church—Introduction of Representations into the Church—The Use and Abuse of Images—Leo the Isaurian, Emperor—The Christians taunted by the Mahometans—Leo's two Edicts against Images—Opposition to the Edicts at Constantinople and Rome—Letters of Pope Gregory II. to the Emperor—Pope Gregory III.—Celtic and English Missionaries in Germany—St. Willibrord—St. Winfrid or Boniface, the *Apostle of Germany*—Growing Pretensions of the Popes—Boniface's work in Germany—His Martyrdom in Frisia—He Romanised Germany—Tried to do the same, but unsuccessfully, in England—Council of Cloveshoo—The Emperor Constantine Copronymus—His opposition to Images—Iconoclastic Council of Constantinople—Persecution of the Monks—St. John Damascene—The Empress Irene—Second Council of Nice—Its Decrees accepted at Rome and Italy, but not in Britain, Gaul, and Germany—The Empress Theodora—The Victory of the Images—Eucharistic Controversy—Paschasius Radbert—Ratramn—Rabanus Maurus—John Scotus Erigena—The Predestinarian Controversy—Gottshalk—Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims—The relations between East and West strained by the Iconoclastic Controversy—Degeneracy of the Descendants of Clovis—The Mayors of the Palace—The Pipin family—Charles Martel—His Victory over the Saracens—The Lombards—Friendly relations between the Popes and the Franks—Pipin the Little, King of the Franks—Creates the Temporal Power of the Popes—Charlemagne and Alcuin—The Caroline Books—Synod of Frankfort—The Forged Decretals—Charlemagne crowned Emperor of the West—The Holy Roman Empire—The Adoptionist Heresy—The Paulicians.

No fiercer controversy ever agitated the Church than that with regard to the worship of Images in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries. It produced, says Gibbon, the revolt of Italy, the temporal power of the Popes, and the restoration of the Roman Empire in the West. It was, says Dean Milman, not a controversy but a feud; not a polemic strife, but actual war declared by one part of Christendom against another. The Iconoclastic (εἰκὼν κλάσμα, Image breaking) Controversy arose when the Mahomedan army were in the high tide of victory, and when Constantinople

itself barely escaped the general onslaught. It grew out of the attempt of a low-born and illiterate Isaurian adventurer, who, a man of great courage and genius in war, had, as a just reward for his military talents, been raised from the condition of a peasant to that of Emperor, and who thought that it belonged to him, as Emperor, to impose his own judgment on the Religion of the Church.

The services of the Primitive Church were marked by an extreme simplicity. For the first three hundred years of Christianity no Images, nor even Pictures, in churches were allowed, the use of the latter being censured in the Spanish Council of Illiberis (Elvira), about A.D. 310. But after the time of Constantine, churches began to be adorned with the gifts of the faithful, amongst which, about the middle of the Fourth Century, Crosses appear to have been first erected, as a means of instructing the ignorant, and of gratifying the heathen converts, whose former worship had habituated them to such outward forms. Towards the end of the century, Pictures and Images of the Martyrs and Saints were gradually introduced, and Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, speaks of people in his time being *adorers* of Pictures. Their abuse and adoration grew by insensible degrees; and although not sanctioned by any General Council, they were recognised before the end of the Sixth Century, their acceptance or rejection depending upon the characteristics and temperament of the various Nations of the Empire, and the complacency of the Bishops. St. Gregory the Great, whilst he held that Pictures were a useful means of instructing the ignorant, deprecated their adoration.

The use and abuse of Pictures and Images was so finely drawn, that they gradually degenerated into a cause of idolatry and violation of the Second Commandment. Whereas the better educated amongst the people recognised the spiritual truths which they typified, the poorer and ignorant classes would be, and were, led to reverence the material representations them-

selves. And there is no doubt that a large, perhaps the largest, body of Christians, when they were told of Images having fallen down from heaven, (and such a fabulous invention attaches now-a-days to the well-known statue of St. Peter in the Cathedral at Rome), and of the miracles which in a credulous age they were believed to perform, did carry Image-worship to an alarming extent.

A reaction against such excessive reverence had already set in, and the seeds of the future controversy were sown, in the reign of Philippicus (711—713). The Emperor, being a Monothelite, objected to the Sixth General Council which had condemned that sect; and (A.D. 712), by the advice of John, Patriarch of Constantinople, ordered a Picture representing the Council to be removed from the Cathedral of St. Sophia, and sent an order for the removal of all similar representations from the churches in Rome. Pope Constantine I. (708—715), so far from complying with the order, caused six Pictures of the Six General Councils to be placed in the porch of St. Peter's, and in a Council at Rome denounced the Emperor as an Apostate. Thus Constantine gained a decisive victory over the Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople; in the next year the Emperor was blinded in his sleep and deposed, and the controversy slumbered during the short reigns of his two successors, Anastasius II. and Theodosius III.

The race of Heraclius had now, after a continuance of a hundred years, died out, to be succeeded by the line of Isaurian Emperors, of whom Leo III. (716—741), surnamed the Isaurian, was the first. The new Emperor, born amongst the Isaurian mountains, had learnt there a simpler Faith than he found prevailing at Constantinople. The Iconoclastic Controversy which broke out under him is closely connected with the religion of the Mahometans, and their hatred of idols or of anything which detracted from their worship of the One God. At the time when the tottering Byzantine Empire was in imminent danger from their

attacks, the Mahometans taunted the Christians with their superstitious reverence. The Emperor, who felt the truth of the taunt, desired to remove the cause. But in any case, if the Church wished to convert its formidable enemies, it was desirable that steps should be taken to remove the imputation, the justice of which it could not deny, and which cast a stumbling-block in the way of those who considered it superstitious.

But it was objectionable that such a reformation in the worship of the Church should proceed, not from the spiritual authorities, but from an overstrained idea of an Emperor as to his temporal rights over the Church. Leo was the very man whom the political circumstances of the time required, but he was not on that account adapted to the office of an ecclesiastical legislator. It is true that he only followed the tradition of the Emperors; but the system was altogether wrong; it was most unreasonable that the Religion of the Church should be regulated, at one time by an Arian like Constantius, at another by an Apostate like Julian, and now by a low-born and uneducated soldier, like Leo.

For the first ten years of his reign he acquiesced in the teaching and existing Ritual of the Church. In the sixth year of his reign he ordered the compulsory Baptism of Jews and Montanists. In his tenth year (A.D. 726) he began to wage war against the Images. He commenced with forbidding their worship, and issued an order in that year that they should be placed at a greater height in the churches, where, although visible to the eye, they would be removed from the customary touching and kissing by the people.

Not meeting with the success which he had expected in preventing the worship, he (A.D. 730) issued a second edict of greater rigour, ordering the removal and destruction of the Images, and the walls on which pictures were painted to be whitewashed. The edict was at once followed by fierce tumults; the people were broken up into two opposing factions,

equalling each other in violence, the Iconolatrists, or Worshipers, and the Iconoclasts, the opposers and breakers of the Images. Not only was it opposed in Rome by the Pope, Gregory II. (715—731), and in the Provinces, but in Constantinople itself, where the Emperor was residing. Orthodox and Monothelites were alike opposed to the attack on the objects of their common reverence, and the Monothelites began to be absorbed into the Church. In vain the Venerable Patriarch Germanus, a man ninety-five years of age, remonstrated with the Emperor, reminding him that by his coronation oath he had bound himself to make no changes in Religion. Now the Patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople were for once united. The Emperor tried to induce Germanus to subscribe the edict; on his refusal he was deposed, Anastasius (731—754), an Iconoclast and Secretary of the Emperor, being appointed in his place.

When one of the Imperial officers, who was sent to carry out the order, mounted on a ladder, and thrice struck with his axe a statue of the Saviour, the women of Constantinople pulled down the ladder, and the officer was beaten to death with the clubs of the excited multitude. The Emperor sent soldiers to appease the tumult, and a fearful massacre ensued. Nor were the riots confined to the Imperial city. The monks of the Archipelago rose in rebellion, denouncing the enemy of Christ, of His Mother and the Saints; they proclaimed a new Emperor, and fitted out a fleet against Constantinople; the fleet, however, was easily overcome, and their leaders either killed in battle, or afterwards, together with the usurper, executed.

The conduct of Pope Gregory II. was dignified, and, under the circumstances, moderate. Later Popes would have deposed and excommunicated Leo; but Gregory, although he denied the right of the Emperor thus to interfere with the Church, disclaimed for himself such a power. At the same time the tone which he assumes in his two letters to Leo shews to what

a height the Papacy had advanced. Gregory does not exhibit himself a learned man, and in the letters passages are found which indicate that the knowledge of the Scriptures was far from familiar to him.

He tells the Emperor that not only Christians but unbelievers were scandalised with his impiety. You, he says, accuse the Christians with idolatry. But, he tells him, his ignorance was such that if he entered a grammar-school and avowed himself the enemy of Images, the simple and pious children would throw their books at his head. Why, as Head of Christendom, had he not consulted the wise as to Images which have been used since Apostolic times, instead of treating the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the Six Councils with contempt? Who worship Images? The Pope denies that the Christians worship wood and stone; genuine likenesses of the Saviour, His Mother, the Apostles, and all the Martyrs, were made and disseminated throughout the world, not for the purpose of worship, but for reverence. God the Father could not be painted, because He has not manifested His Person in a visible likeness.

To the Civil authority, he continues, appertains the sword of justice, with power over the body; to the Church belongs the more formidable weapon of Excommunication, for the destruction of the body, but salvation of the soul. By the authority of St. Peter he might have inflicted such punishment upon him; but as the Emperor had heaped a curse upon himself, he left him to suffer under it. Though he threatened to break in pieces at Rome the statue of St. Peter, whom the nations regard as a God upon earth, and to carry off the Pope a prisoner, as the Emperor Constans had his predecessor Martin, yet the sequel of the history of the two should be a warning to him; for whilst *Constans* was cut off in his sins by the hand of a domestic, Martin is adored as a Saint. As to himself, he could easily defy the Emperor by retiring twenty-four miles into Campania, where the Emperor might as easily follow the wind as follow

him: whilst the barbarians have embraced the Gospel, you, he tells him, are deaf to the voice of the Shepherd. These pious barbarians are kindled into rage and thirst for vengeance. If you persist, your blood be upon your own head. The letters, as the Pope probably expected, had not the effect of deflecting the Emperor from his purpose.

Gregory II. dying A.D. 731, was succeeded by a Pope equally zealous in the cause of the Images, Gregory III. (731—741). In a Council attended by ninety-eight Bishops, the new Pope anathematised all those (and amongst them the Emperor was included) who attacked the traditions of the Church, and the Images of the Saints. Both he and the Emperor died in the same year (A.D. 741).

Meanwhile, during the time that the Church was losing in the East, it was gaining ground in the West, especially in Germany, and chiefly by the aid of English Missionaries. The Gospel had been preached in that country under the Roman Empire, for we find a Bishop from Treves and another from Cologne present at the Council of Arles. It had been revived, as we have before seen ^a, by Celtic missionaries, SS. Columban, Gall, Kilian, and their companions.

The energetic Wilfrid ^b had been the pioneer of Christianity amongst the savage Freislanders. The work of Wilfrid was taken up at the end of the Seventh Century by an Englishman named Willibrord, who, A.D. 692, received the license of Pope Sergius I. to preach in their country as Archbishop of the Frisians. The Frankish kingdom was then reigned over by the Merovingians, although the real power was in the hands of Mayors (*Majores*) of the Palace, and Willibrord, who was A.D. 696 consecrated Archbishop by Sergius, with the permission of the then Mayor, Pipin of Heristhal, fixed his See at Trajectum (Utrecht).

^a See p. 275.

^b See p. 303.

But to another Englishman, Winfrid (one that *wins peace*), the title of *Apostle of Germany* pre-eminently belongs.

Born at Crediton, A.D. 680, and educated in the Monastery of Nutselle (perhaps the modern Netley), and ordained Priest when he was about thirty years of age, he, A.D. 715, crossed to Friesland to join Willibrord in his work amongst the Frisians. But it was at a time when war was raging between the savage Frisian King Radbod and Charles Martel, the son, and successor in the Mayoralty, of Pipin; Willibrord was forced to retire from the scene of his labours, and Winfrid also returned to Nutselle, where he remained till A.D. 718. Perhaps during that time he preached in the Isle of Wight, where his name is still preserved in Bonchurch.

In 718 he went to Rome, with commendatory letters from Daniel, Bishop of Winchester, to Pope Gregory II., who gave his sanction to his preaching the Gospel amongst the heathen tribes of Germany.

The progress of Christianity in Germany was cotemporaneous with a great advance in the Papal power, and the Popes, not contented with the Primacy of honour which was accorded to them, now claimed a Supremacy, grounded upon a divine right inherited from St. Peter, over the whole Western Church. The Church, at a time when Christendom was overwhelmed with troubles, and the Eastern Patriarchates were little more than names, threw itself more and more on the great Patriarchate of the West, and was repaid by the haughty demands of Rome; and now came in vogue the ultimatum, the "*volumus et jubemus*," (*we wish, we order*), of the Popes.

The great secret of Rome's success was its marvellous organising power, and from early Mediæval times the unequal contest was carried on between an organised Catholicism on one side, and the ranks of an undisciplined Catholicism on the other. And there can be little doubt that in such unsettled and troublous times, a common Centre of Unity, especially when

the fountain-head was pure, was of the first importance to the spread of Christianity; but at the same time it sapped the independence of National Churches.

Nowhere, outside Italy, did the claim for Supremacy by Rome find at this time such devoted adherents as amongst the Clergy in England. England never forgot its debt of gratitude to Rome; nor how one Pope, St. Gregory, had sent St. Augustine into England, and how Archbishop Theodore, sent by another Pope, had organised the National Church. And the Council of Whitby had weakened the Celtic, and given the victory to the Roman, party.

It was for such reasons that Willibrord before proceeding on his mission to Frisia travelled to Rome to obtain from the Roman Pontiff, not only his blessing, but his permission to preach (*licentiam et benedictionem*). In like manner Boniface, having received a commission from the Pope, preached for a time in Thuringia; but hearing that the previous difficulties in Frisia were removed by the death of Radbod, he rejoined Willibrord. Winfrid wrote to Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, that he had received permission, without which it would have been impossible for him to preach in the country, from Charles Martel. After spending three years there he went and preached amongst the Hessians. On the summons of the Pope he (A.D. 722) went to Rome for a second time, where, on November 30, he was consecrated as a missionary Bishop by Gregory, who exacted from him an oath of fealty similar to that taken by Italian Bishops, and gave him the name of Boniface.

Having received (A.D. 723) the permission of Charles Martel to work as Bishop in Hesse, he returned to that country, and having felled in the presence of a large Pagan assembly, at Geismar in Upper Hesse, a gigantic oak inviolably consecrated to Thor, the god of Thunder, he thus made the way for the overthrow of Teutonic Paganism. The Pagans, recognising the impotence of their favourite god, lent a willing ear to the

Christian Missionaries; several other missionaries joined them from England; an immense number of converts was made in Hesse and Thuringia; and Christian Churches and Monasteries arose on all sides.

Having preached in those countries for fifteen years, Boniface (A.D. 738) paid a third visit to Rome, where Gregory III. had been Pope since A.D. 731. After a year he left Rome for Bavaria, where he erected the Sees of Passau, Regensburg (Ratisbon, the Bavarian Capital), Salzburg, and Freisingen. Three years afterwards he erected in central Germany the Sees of Warzburg, Eichstadt (over which he placed Willibald, an Englishman, as Bishop), Erfurt, and Buraburg.

Both in Bavaria and Thuringia, Boniface found at work a zealous body of missionaries from Ireland, who were opposed "to the traditions of the Roman See;" who claimed the independence of the Celtic Church, and advocated in the monasteries the Columban instead of the Benedictine Rule. Boniface determined to carry out in Germany the same organising system which had been adopted by Archbishop Theodore in England, of binding together all the Churches under one Roman Communion. Pope Gregory himself wrote to some German Bishops enjoining them to adopt the Roman customs as taught by Boniface, and to avoid the false teaching of missionaries who came from Britain or any other quarter. Against other than the Roman Clergy, Boniface imputes charges of immorality and wickedness; but when he accuses the Bishops with being *fornicarii*, which simply means that they were married men and advocated clerical marriage, as permitted in the Celtic Church, other charges may be similarly discounted.

In 741 Willibrord died. In 743, circumstances rendering it impracticable to establish his See as he desired at Cologne, where he would have been nearer to his Frisian converts, Boniface became Archbishop of Maintz. But he still yearned for Frisia, the scene of his first labours; so, having appointed Lull,

one of the missionaries who had joined him from England, as his successor at Maintz, he started (A.D. 755) for that country with fifty-two companions, only to win with them, at the age of seventy-five, the Martyrs' Crown, on Whitsun-day of that year.

Boniface converted, but he also Romanised, Germany. In a letter to Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, he styles himself "Legate of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of Rome;" he speaks of his having effected the submission to Rome of the German Church, and advises Cuthbert to pursue the same course with regard to England. Cuthbert, A.D. 747, summoned a Council at Cloveshoo; but when the question of submission to Rome was brought before the Council, it was at once shelved.

We must now return to the Iconoclastic Controversy in the East. Constantine V. (741—755), nick-named Copronymus (a name of filthy derivation), who from his infancy had displayed an aversion to Holy things, succeeded his father Leo in the Empire, Zacharias (741—752) being Pope. Anastasius, the unworthy Patriarch of Constantinople, who was at one time a worshipper of Images, at another an Iconoclast, according as circumstances suited him, and now a rebel against the Emperor, brought upon himself a melancholy but not undeserved punishment. Having his eyes put out, seated upon an ass with his head towards the tail, he was ignominiously paraded through the city; after which he was restored to his patriarchal dignity, in which he died A.D. 754.

Constantine, who is accused by his enemies of every kind of vice, as well as being in Religion a heretic and an Atheist, whilst the Iconoclasts praise his virtues, was as violent an opponent of, and practised even greater cruelty than his father against the Image-worshippers. He probably was not as bad as his enemies accuse him with being, for it is impossible that such a multitude of vices could be combined in one person; but it appears that whilst he was gifted with much military talent, his character was deeply stained with profligacy and cruelty. Being,

however, a strenuous opponent of Images, he summoned, A.D. 754, an Iconoclastic Council of Constantinople, which the Greeks consider the Seventh General Council, but which on the contrary in the West is held heretical. It met in the suburbs of Constantinople and lasted six months, being attended by three hundred and thirty-eight Bishops. No Patriarch attended it. The See of Constantinople was vacant: the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antioch were the subjects of the Mahometan Caliph. Stephen I., the successor of Zacharias in the See of Rome, died before consecration, and Stephen II. (752—757) refused to attend the Council. In the absence of the Patriarch of Constantinople, Theodosius, Archbishop of Ephesus, and occasionally the Bishop of Perga, presided. The Council expressed its agreement with the six General Councils, denounced all representations in the services of religion by Picture or Sculpture, as Pagan and idolatrous, and ordered them to be erased or destroyed. The Eucharist alone was declared to be the proper Image of Christ. The work of demolition was entrusted to the Imperial officers, to whom instructions were given to respect the vestments and other furniture and the Cross, in the churches. An anathema was pronounced against the upholders of Images, amongst whom John Damascene, under the name of Mansur, was particularly mentioned.

The monks denounced the Emperor as an Heresiarch and a second Mahomet, and all the Iconoclasts as Atheists and blasphemers; and in consequence in the fearful persecution that followed they were the principal sufferers, being subjected to imprisonment, mutilation and death.

Constantine (754—766), the successor of Anastasius in the Patriarchate of Constantinople, met with even a more miserable fate than his predecessor. He had been a monk but, unlike the monks generally, was an Iconoclast. The Emperor had now determined to root out Monasticism; and the Patriarch

was compelled to mount the pulpit and swear by the Holy Cross, not only never to be a worshipper of Images, but to abjure his monastic vows. Being afterwards accused of thwarting the Emperor, he was sent into banishment ; and Nicetas, a Eunuch, contrary to the Canons of the Church which forbid such an appointment, was nominated in his place. Constantine, however, was reinstated ; but after suffering various acts of ignominy, and being cruelly buffeted, Nicetas having read the sentence of excommunication against him, he was beheaded.

Having inflicted every kind of personal punishment on the monks, the Emperor wreaked a wholesale vengeance on their possessions. The monastic societies were everywhere dissolved ; their lands and cattle confiscated ; their buildings converted into magazines, barracks, or stables. The habit and profession of monks was rigorously proscribed, and even the consecrated Virgins were forced to marry.

St. John Damascene (so called from his native place of Damascus), who was anathematised by the late Council, was the intrepid champion, and the ablest literary defender, of the Images. He was also the most learned of the Greek writers of the times, and is considered the last (unless perhaps St. Bernard shares with him the honour) of the Fathers.

Born towards the end of the Seventh Century, of Christian parents, he received his education from a learned Greek monk, named Cosmas, who having been taken prisoner of war by the Saracens, and brought to Damascus for sale, was ransomed by John's father, Sergius. On the death of his father, John was appointed by the Caliph to succeed him as Governour of Damascus, and when Leo the Isaurian issued his Edict against the Images, he, although holding high office under the Saracens, entered the lists against him. The able treatise which he wrote on the subject at once raised him to the position of leader of the Image-worshippers, on whose behalf he again wrote against the Edict of Constantine, with the effect of at once enlisting the

Clergy, but especially the monks, against the Iconoclasts. The line which John took was, that, as the Church cannot err, it cannot fall into idolatry, and that the veneration which Christians paid to Images was wholly distinct from the *Latria* which they paid to God.

The story goes that being accused of traitorous designs against the Mahometans, he was sentenced to have his hand cut off; but that in the same night, whilst he slept, his hand was miraculously restored by the Virgin Mary. The Caliph was thereby so convinced of his innocence that he ordered him to be reinstated in his office.

But after the treatment which he had received, John Damascene, dissatisfied with the world and his worldly dignities, about A.D. 730, abandoned all his distinctions, and, together with Cosmas, retired into the Laura of Saba, near the Dead Sea, and ten miles from Jerusalem. Cosmas was afterwards appointed Bishop of Mazuma, in Palestine. John, who soon after his retreat to Saba was ordained a Priest, only departed from the Laura once, with the object of stirring up an opposition against the Iconoclastic measures of the Emperor Constantine. The last years of his life he spent in study and in writing several valuable works on Theology, dying in his Laura about A.D. 755.

Leo IV. (775—780), surnamed Chazarus, succeeded his father Constantine. The Laws against Images still continued to exist, but as he was a man of gentle and religious mind, the Church and Empire enjoyed a respite during his short reign, and the monks were allowed to return to their Monasteries. His wife, Irene, a cruel and intriguing woman, and of abandoned and profligate character, was during the life of her husband a secret favourer of Images. On his death (as it was believed by poison administered by Irene, whose infidelity he had discovered), she assumed the government during the minority of her son, Constantine Porphyrogenitus (780—797), a boy ten years of age at his accession. She at once resolved to terminate the triumph of

the Iconoclasts, towards which she took the first step by issuing an edict of toleration for both parties. Paul (780—784), who had been appointed Patriarch of Constantinople in succession to Nicetas, smitten by remorse of conscience for the course he had taken in opposing the Images, and in accepting the Patriarchate at a time when it was separated from Christendom, retired into a monastery, and on his death-bed recommended that a General Council should be held, as the only means of healing the schism of the Church, and of terminating the Iconoclastic divisions. In order to obtain a Patriarch favourable to her views, Irene appointed her secretary, Tarasius (784—806), at the time only a layman, to succeed; she raised the lately persecuted monks to the highest stations, and replaced the Iconoclastic guards with others more favourably disposed to the cause. Tarasius accepted the Patriarchate on condition that a Council should be convened to decide the question; and Irene determined to summon a General Council which would be important enough to nullify the late Council of Constantinople; she sent a message to Pope Hadrian I. (772—795) inviting him to attend the Council either in person or by deputy.

The Council, attended by three hundred and fifty Ecclesiastics, amongst whom were one hundred and thirty monks, met at Nice, the seat of the first General Council, on September 24, A.D. 787. It held eight sessions between September 24 and October 23. Although Tarasius actually took the lead, the most honourable seat was accorded to the two Papal legates. There were also representatives of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, the Patriarchs themselves, who were under subjection to the Saracens, not being able to leave home. This, the Second Council of Nice, was afterwards recognised both by East and West as a General Council, and for a time effected a better feeling between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople. It confirmed the decrees of the Six General Councils, and reversed those of the Iconoclastic

Council of Constantinople. It decreed that, together with the venerable and life-giving Cross, Images of the Saviour, of His immaculate Mother, and of the Angels and Saints, should be set up, whether in colours, or mosaic-work, or any other material whatever, on the sacred vessels, and walls, and tablets of the churches; on houses and in highways; that adoration (*προσκύνησιν*, which included *kissing*), should be paid to them, but not worship (*λατρείαν*), which last belongs exclusively to God. The opponents of the Images were anathematised. The Images sanctioned by the Council, it must be remarked, were not works of sculpture, but *flat* pictures and mosaics, which the Greek Church has ever since observed.

Pope Hadrian at Rome accepted the decrees of the Council, and Italy followed the example of the Pope. But in the Churches of Britain, Germany, and Gaul, the sanction of the Pope was not regarded as binding, and a middle course, as we shall see later on, was adopted.

In the East, notwithstanding the Second Council of Nice, the Iconoclastic controversy still continued with varying results under the next five Emperors, one Emperor approving, and then another condemning, its decrees. A rupture soon occurred when the young Emperor reached his majority, between him and his unnatural mother, which only ended by his being deprived of his eyes when he was asleep by the emissaries of Irene; after this the blind Emperor, being practically rendered incapable of government, continued to reign till A.D. 797. During that period the government of the Empire was entirely in the hands of Irene, who reigned for five years after his dethronement (797—802); till she herself being also dethroned in a conspiracy headed by her secretary Nicephorus, was banished to the Isle of Lesbos, where she gained a scanty existence by the labour of her own hands, and terminated her wicked life a few months afterwards. With her perished the Isaurian dynasty.

Under Leo the Armenian (813—820), for whom his religious

inconstancy gained the title of Chamelion, the Iconoclastics again enjoyed a short-lived victory.

Theophilus (829—842) was the last and most cruel of the Iconoclastic Emperors, but on his death the long contest was destined to end in the permanent victory of the Image-worshippers. Theodora his widow, who during the minority of her son Michael III. (842—867), whose character is delineated in the unenviable sobriquet of *the Drunkard*, entirely administered the Empire, resolved to restore the Images. Having deposed John the Iconoclast Patriarch of Constantinople, she appointed in his place the orthodox Methodius, from whom she obtained for her late husband absolution from his Iconoclastic sins. She convened a Council which re-affirmed the decrees of the Second Council of Nice; the Images were (A.D. 842) restored to the Capital, and a solemn Festival, which is still observed in the Eastern Church, was appointed to commemorate the event.

The Iconoclastic controversy was not the only one which disturbed the Church at this time; two others, one with regard to the Holy Eucharist, the other respecting the doctrine of Predestination, had their origin in the Ninth Century. A supernatural change in the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist found advocates in St. John Damascene and early writers of the Greek Church, and the Second Council of Nice had determined that they were after Consecration the very Body and Blood of Christ. In the controversy on the subject in the Western Church, which took place in the Ninth Century, Paschasius Radbert and Ratramn were the principal actors. The controversy was as to whether there was a Material or Spiritual Presence in the Sacrament, the latter of which had been accepted as the doctrine of St. Augustine, the great authority in the West.

Paschasius Radbert, born in the early years of the Ninth Century, was a learned monk, and afterwards (844—851) Abbot of the Benedictine Convent of Corbey in the Diocese of Amiens.

In a treatise "On the Body and Blood of Christ," written A.D. 844, he maintained that after Consecration the Material elements are so changed that nothing but the outward accidents remain, and that the same Body and Blood of Christ, in which He was born of the Virgin Mary, was crucified and ascended into Heaven, are conveyed to all Communicants; but in those persons only who receive them worthily have they a beneficial effect. This afterwards became the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, and since the Lateran Council, A.D. 1215, has been known under the name of Transubstantiation. But, contrary to the Romanists, Radbert advocated the Cup for the Laity, against reservation, which was not decreed till the Council of Constance (1414—1418).

His principal opponent, Ratramn or Bertram, who was, under Radbert, a Monk at Corbey, wrote, at the request of Charles the Bald, a book against him, "On the Body and Blood of the Lord," and it was said that to this book Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, attributed his change in opinion on the doctrine. Ratramn advocated the view of St. Augustine, that there is a Real, although not Corporal, Presence in the Eucharist; that the outward elements remain after consecration, not to the senses only, but in reality, the same as they were before, but that they are to the faithful recipient the Body and Blood of Christ. In other words, as our Church Catechism says, "the Body and Blood of Christ . . . are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful."

Amongst others who in the Carlovingian age held the doctrine of Ratramn, was Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Maintz, a disciple of Alcuin, whilst Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, held with Radbert.

John Scotus Erigena (an Irishman or Scotchman, which meant the same thing), who had the reputation of being one of the most learned men of the time, and who found patrons in Charles the Bald and King Alfred of England, took part both in the

Eucharistic and Predestinarian Controversies. He was a Neo-Platonist, whose object was to ground Theology on human Reason, whereby Christianity was little more than a Philosophy. That he held a professorial chair at Oxford, as was stated, is improbable, for the University seems to owe its foundation to a later time than the reign of Alfred. He held an extreme view, opposed alike to Radbert and Ratramn, that the Eucharist is a bare sign or memorial of the Body and Blood of Christ.

The Predestinarian Controversy originated with Gottshalk, once a monk of Fulda. He had in his childhood been sent by his father, a Saxon Count, to that monastery; but when he arrived at manhood, he disputed his father's right so to dispose of him against his will, and a Synod of Maintz, A.D. 829, decided in his favour. Against this decision Rabanus Maurus, who was at the time Abbot of Fulda, appealed to the Emperor, whose decision was unfavourable to Gottshalk; he was allowed, however, to exchange into the monastery of Orbais, in the Diocese of Soissons, and in the Province of Rheims. But from this time an ill-feeling was engendered between Rabanus and the maltreated monk.

In his new monastery Gottshalk applied himself to the study of St. Augustine, whose views on Predestination he revived or rather exaggerated. Although St. Augustine was considered one of its greatest authorities by the Latin Church, yet it had never adopted the Augustinian doctrine of Predestination. Going far beyond Augustine, Gottshalk adopted a double Predestination, of the elect to eternal life, of the wicked to eternal death. It was not the Will of God, he maintained, that all, but only those whom He designed, should be saved.

It follows from such a doctrine, that the wicked are lost irrespectively of their conduct in this life, and such a view was opposed to Catholic doctrine, which insisted that all are capable of salvation.

Returning from a Pilgrimage which he had made to Rome

(A.D. 848), Gottshalk communicated his views to Noting, Bishop of Verona, whose acquaintance he had made in Italy; Noting reported them to Rabanus, who in the previous year had been consecrated to the Archbishopric of Maintz. Rabanus replied to Noting, distinguishing between those who are foreknown (*pre-sciti*) and those who are predestined (*predestinati*); the wicked are foreknown by God, but are not predestined by Him.

In October of that year, Gottshalk was summoned before a Council at Maintz, and being condemned by it, was handed over to his Metropolitan, Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims: Hincmar summoned him before a Council (A.D. 849) at Quercy, on the Oise, where Charles the Bald had a Palace. On refusing to recant his opinions, he was condemned, suspended from the Priesthood, publicly scourged, and committed to the Monastery of Hautvilliers. There he died A.D. 869, Hincmar refusing him Communion in his last illness, and ordering his body to be consigned to unconsecrated ground. But the victory so cruelly abused did not add to the credit of Hincmar, and he was condemned by the leading Bishops of the Gallican Church.

It was somewhat inconsistent that Scotus Erigena, with his Rationalistic views, should have been requested by Hincmar to take part in the Predestinarian controversies. His views, however, with regard to Predestination were speedily rejected as heretical absurdities, and he himself was thenceforward generally regarded as insane.

The Iconoclastic Controversy had greatly strained the relations between the Emperor and the Pope. There never had been a cordial union between Rome and the Eastern Empire; the difference of languages, if there had been no other grounds for estrangement, was sufficient to effect and perpetuate an enmity between them. The Greek Emperors, it is true, had restored the Images; but the Iconoclasts, in the reign of Leo the Isaurian, had torn away from Rome its estates in the Diocese of Illyricum, and the refusal of the Emperor to restore them had

created a rankling wound, which the Pope never forgot nor forgave. But in order to understand the events which brought about the first open rupture between the Pope and the Eastern Emperor, we must go back to the period following the death of Clovis, the Merovingian king of the Franks.

The death of Clovis occurred A.D. 511. The degeneracy of his descendants, who resembled him in nothing but his cruelty—it is difficult, says Gibbon, to find anywhere more vice and less virtue—culminated at the end of the Sixth Century in the person of two Frankish Queens, Fredegund and Brunehild, who added to their vices that of being wholesale murderesses, but yet held a supreme power. In the course of time officers appear under the title of Mayors^c of the Palace, with the power, whilst their feeble Merovingian masters held the title, of Kings. With these we are not concerned till we arrive at the time of the two Mayors of the Palace, Pipin of Heristhal, and Charles Martel, at the close of the Seventh and the early years of the Eighth Centuries.

The Pipins, says Mr. Freeman, came from the Eastern, the most German, part of the Frankish Empire, so that their rise to power was almost like another German invasion of Gaul.

The Pipin family came of a very ecclesiastical race, which would naturally incline them in favour of the Church. One of the founders of the family was St. Arnulf, Duke of Austrasia, and Mayor of the Palace, who by his marriage became the grandfather of Pipin of Heristhal. The pious disposition of Arnulf leading him to prefer the life of an ecclesiastic to that of a Statesman, he was (A.D. 614), consecrated to the Bishopric of Metz, after which he led a life of severe austerity, always, we are told, wearing a hair-shirt under his garments, whilst his ordinary food was barley and water. When he took Holy Orders, his pious wife assumed the veil in a monastery at Truro, St. Arnulf himself afterwards resigning his bishopric to lead the

^c See p. 336.

life of a monk in the deserts of the Vosges, near Remiremont, till his death (A.D. 641). One of his sons succeeded him in the Bishopric of Metz.

This ecclesiastical connection of the Pipin family may account for the remarkable alliance between the Franks and the Western Church, which resulted in one of the most important turning-points in the history of the world.

The way for the conversion of Germany was cleared by Charles Martel's victory, and the defeat and death of Radbod the King of Frisia. Radbod was a furious heathen, and under persecution from him more than one missionary had been compelled to return to England. The story is told of him, how that, when he once entertained thoughts of embracing Christianity, on being informed that his Pagan ancestors were suffering in Hell, he decided that he would rather suffer with them there, than enjoy Heaven with the Christians. His death facilitated the preaching of the Gospel by SS. Willibrord and Boniface in Frisia^d.

In 732 Charles gained over the Saracens the great battle of Tours, from which he received the name of Martel (*hammer*), thus overcoming the most dangerous enemy that ever threatened Western Christendom. The battle was one of the great battles of the world, which if it had resulted otherwise would have affected, and perhaps changed, the whole subsequent history of Christianity. He was thenceforward regarded as the champion of the Faith. He did not scruple, in order to maintain the efficiency of his army, to use the property of the Church, nor to bestow some of its most lucrative Bishoprics on his soldiers and adherents. Notwithstanding this, new relations, leading to most important results, were established between the Franks and the Popes, who found it to their advantage to court the friendship of the most powerful Ruler in the world.

In Italy, the Edicts of the Iconoclast Emperor Leo had provoked even greater hostility, and created severer con-

^d See p. 337 sq.

tentions, than in Constantinople, and the Italians vowed to live or die in defence of their holy images. The Lombards (between whom and the Italians the bitter hatred, which commenced when the former were Arians, had not diminished after they were converted to orthodoxy), at first took part with the Romans, as champions of the Images. Luitbrand (712—744), the most powerful of all the Lombard kings, joined Pope Gregory II. against the Greeks of Ravenna, which he entered as a conqueror, the Catholics of the Exarchate welcoming him as their deliverer. But the enmity between the two people was too deeply rooted to be thus eradicated; Luitbrand shifted about from side to side; till the next Pope, Gregory III., in his distress, applied to Charles Martel for assistance. Charles received the ambassadors of the Pope with reverence, but the shortness of his remaining life precluded him from rendering any effectual support. Both Charles Martel and Pope Gregory III. died A.D. 741. But the ice was broken; the Franks, the rising power of the West, and the Popes, had thenceforward a common cause and a community of interests, and the Franks were regarded as the protectors of the Pope.

Charles Martel left two sons, one of whom, Carloman, soon resigned all earthly ambition to retire into the monastery of Monte Casino; whilst the other, Pipin, surnamed the Little (741—768), succeeded as Mayor of the Palace to Chilperic III.; Zacharias (741—752) became Pope of Rome. The new Mayor of the Palace and the new Pope soon saw an opportunity of mutually assisting each other. Pipin felt that the time had arrived that the servile title which he bore, and the empty royalty of the Merovingian dynasty, should come to an end. But to put an end to an ancient dynasty was a serious matter. If he could enlist the sympathy of the spiritual Head of Christendom; if the Pope could be induced to sanction the revolution, then the proceeding would assume a different aspect, and the popular conscience be satisfied. So he sent to Pope Zacharias a suggestion in the name of the Frankish people,

whether it was not consistent with reason that he who possessed the power should also possess the title of King. The Pope, glad of such an opportunity of aggrandising the authority of the Papal See by adjudicating on the Frankish Crown, decided that the two offices of Mayor of the Palace and of King ought to be amalgamated.

Zacharias however died (A.D. 752) before anything definite was settled. His successor, Stephen I., dying before his consecration, was succeeded by Stephen II. (752—757). Pipin had already been consecrated at Soissons by the English Missionary St. Boniface, Archbishop of Maintz, acting in the name and by the consent of the Pope. But now a second Coronation was performed (A.D. 754), in the Abbey of St. Dionysius (or St. Denys), by Pope Stephen, who had travelled into France to request Pipin's aid against the Lombards. Pipin was invested with the title, not of King or Emperor (matters had not as yet advanced as far as that), but of Patrician of Rome, and Chilperic, the last of the Line of Clovis, was consigned for the rest of his life to a monastery. Thus the Pope of Rome was the means of deposing one Ruler and setting up another.

In return for this act, Pipin made the cause of the Pope his own, and was equally bountiful in his concessions. Alighting from his horse, and conducting the Pope to his Palace, he promised him the help which he had requested against the Lombards. He not only saved Rome in two invasions of the Lombards (A.D. 754 and 755) under their king Aistulf, but he forced them to give up the Exarchate of Ravenna, which they had lately taken from the Greeks; and this, as well as a large tract of country which he conquered from Aistulf, he bestowed upon the Papacy. Thus was laid the foundation of Rome's temporal power, and thenceforward the Pope took rank amongst the temporal sovereigns of the world.

The coronation of Pipin by the Pope, and the transference of the kingdom of France from the Merovingians, was an event of

the greatest and widest importance. The new masters of the Frankish Kingdom were the hereditary Dukes of Austrasia, and therefore Germans. Pipin at his death (A.D. 768) had consolidated under his own family all the conquests of Clovis; and laid the foundations of modern Germany. Thus began the dynasty of the Carolingians; the dominions of Pipin were much added to by his son Charles the Great, or Charlemagne, who was master of the whole of Germany and Gaul.

Pipin was succeeded by his two sons, Charles (768—814) and Carloman, who, together with their father, had been anointed by Pope Stephen. By the death of Carloman (A.D. 771), Charles, to whom posterity gave the title of Charles the Great (contracted in the French language into Charlemagne), became sole King of the Franks, whose relations with the Papacy became more intimate than even those of his father, and who completed the work initiated by his two predecessors.

The Lombards again troubled Rome in the Pontificate of Hadrian I. (772—795). In 774 Charlemagne (to anticipate his name) defeated in battle the Lombard King Desiderius, who, being carried away prisoner, was consigned to a Frankish monastery; Desiderius was the last of the Lombard line; the Lombard dominion was annihilated, and Charles himself was crowned King of Lombardy the same year. Charlemagne thus combined in his person the titles of King of the Franks and Lombards, and Patrician of the Romans. He confirmed the former grant made by Pipin, and enlarged it with the territory which he had conquered from the Lombards. Thus the ascendancy of one German race was overthrown by another of the same race. Thenceforward the Lombards lived as peaceable subjects under a Frankish King.

Charles, as soon as he became King of the Franks, set himself to the revival of literature and theology, which by his time had become almost extinct in his kingdom; and amongst those whom he selected to aid him in the work was the Englishman,

Alcuin. Under the lax discipline of the Merovingian Kings, the degeneracy of the Clergy had attained a great height, and worldliness and license invaded the highest places in the Church. Bishops became a privileged class, and lived the lives of courtiers; instead of attending to their duties, they engaged themselves in the pursuit of worldly greatness and power, imitating the Dukes and Nobles, and often rode to, and fell in, the wars. On this secular mode of living followed a decay of learning and a general ignorance, in which the Monasteries, the former resorts of learning, partook; many of the Clergy were unable to write or even to read, beyond what was required for their perfunctory duties, much less were they able to explain the rudiments of Faith to the laity; "he who knew Grammar was accounted learned," says Baronius.

The schools of Britain and Ireland were at that time the best in Europe, and the learning which had been instilled by Theodore never forsook it in the dark days of Literature. Amongst the learned scholars of the day the Venerable Bede (673—734), the monk of Jarrow, stood supreme. Second only to him was Alcuin (735—804), who was born in the same year in which Egbert, a Prelate of great learning, obtained the Pall of a Metropolitan from Pope Gregory, and became the first *Archbishop* of York. Egbert founded the Cathedral school of York, which became a famous seat of Learning, where Alcuin, the foremost scholar of the day, born after Bede's death, was educated, and afterwards became "Magister Scholarum."

To Britain, therefore, Charlemagne, when he wished to revive the almost extinguished literature of France, turned for aid. He had met Alcuin at Parma, on the return of the latter from a visit to Rome, and at Charlemagne's request Alcuin took up his abode at Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle). There Alcuin acted as confidential adviser to Charlemagne, as well as instructor of himself and his family. Under him Charlemagne, a man of apparently no more than average ability, became a proficient in

Latin, and had a moderate acquaintance with Greek, although he never could be taught to write. Under Alcuin schools and seminaries were set up ; whether the University of Paris was at that time founded or not, is uncertain ; but a literary impulse spread throughout Charlemagne's dominions ; and when Alcuin in his old age settled down (A.D. 796) in St. Martin's Monastery at Tours, the schools at Tours became under him, in France, what the school of York was in England. There he remained as Abbot till his death (A.D. 804).

Charlemagne was no blind follower of the Pope. Pope Hadrian accepted the Decrees of the Second Council of Nice, and went further than the East, in allowing, not only painted, but sculptured, Images ; and Italy followed the example of their Pope. But when a copy of the Decrees was sent by the Pope to Charlemagne, under the expectation that he would give them a favourable reception, it was found that his convictions were opposed to them, and his objections were set forth in a treatise on Image-worship (in which probably Alcuin had a hand), known as the Caroline Books. They dissented both from the Iconoclastic Council of 754, but, more especially, from the late Council of Nice, taking up an intermediate position between the two. The claim of the latter Council to be called Œcumenical is questioned by them ; the part assumed by the Empress Irene, a woman, whom St. Paul does not allow a voice in the Church, is blamed ; many passages in its Decrees are dismissed as *madness, obsolete errors, most absurd arguments, only deserving derision* ; whilst the principles laid down by St. Gregory the Great are pronounced to be those of the Catholic Church ; to bow or kneel before, or to kiss, Images is idolatrous ; Images, although not necessary, may still be allowed to adorn the Churches and to aid the memory, and are not to be destroyed.

An important Synod held at Frankfort (A.D. 794)—Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, calls it a General Council—was attended

by three hundred Bishops from France, Germany, and Lombardy, as well as by representatives from England, amongst whom Alcuin took the leading part; and two legates from Rome. Charlemagne presided; the principles of the Caroline Books was adopted; the late Council of Nice was treated with contempt, and its Decrees, although upheld by Pope Hadrian, were condemned, as well as the worship of Images in any form. Hadrian made a full reply to the Caroline Books, a copy of which had been sent to him by Charlemagne, but failed to convince him, and for political reasons the Pope did not carry the matter any further. The Roman See had at that time reason to conciliate, and to court the friendship of, Charlemagne.

About this time (the exact date is uncertain) the most audacious and clumsy imposture which ever saw the light of day, greater if possible than the Pseudo-Clementines*, made its first appearance. There was nothing in the early history of the Church to warrant Rome's extravagant pretension; it lacked an historical basis on which to rest its claims.

Application had often been made to Rome by Bishops outside its jurisdiction for advice and countenance in their disputes with their Metropolitans. This gave rise to *Decretal epistles* containing the advice required. The earliest Decretal hitherto existing was one issued, A.D. 385, by Pope Siricius. In the middle of the Sixth Century, Dionysius Exiguus made a collection of the Canons of the General and chief Provincial Councils, as well as of the Papal Decretals, from the time of Siricius to his own time (A.D. 525), which was generally accepted in the Western Church. About A.D. 630 another collection, with additional documents, appeared, and in order to gain for it respect, was published under the venerable name of Isidore (570—636), Bishop of Seville; and this collection was received particularly in Spain.

The Forged Decretals, known as the Pseudo-Isidore Decretals,

* See p. 69.

were the work of an impostor calling himself Isidorus *Mercator*; (an evident slip for *Peccator*, or sinner, by which title the Bishops of those times were wont to style themselves), and purported to be the work of St. Isidore of Seville.

The Council of Sardica, which was the first Council to bring Rome into prominence, and the Pontificate of Siricius, being both too recent for the claims now made by Rome, some means must be devised by which those claims could be referred to St. Peter. The Forged Decretals therefore preluded the already existing Decretals, by others purporting to have been written by the earliest Bishops of Rome, Anacletus and Clement, the contemporaries of the Apostles. Thus the claims which Rome made for supremacy were sanctioned by a continuous chain of testimony reaching up to the very time of St. Peter; the *cathedra Petri* is the source of all power, and from him the Popes derived their authority. The Forged Decretals contained the acts of several unheard-of Councils, in which the Popes were represented as the Legislators, and guardians of the Faith, from the earliest days of Christianity, and therefore entitled to the right of receiving appeals.

The Forgery was at once apparent; the slip between *Peccator* and *Mercator* was in itself enough to condemn it; but beyond this, there were apparent throughout it an ignorance of history and ludicrous anachronisms, persons living centuries apart being represented as corresponding with each other, and the early Bishops of Rome being made to quote the Scriptures from the Vulgate Version of St. Jerome, which was not published till many years after their death.

The Pseudo-Isidore Decretals are divided into three parts, the second of which contains the *Donation* of Constantine, a myth which had appeared shortly before their publication. The object of the *Donation* was to make people believe that the temporal power of the Papacy, conferred by Pipin and Charlemagne, was merely the restitution of property which had

been bestowed on the See of Rome by the first Christian Emperor, Constantine, but of which it had been deprived during the Lombard invasions. The story ran, that Constantine, having been baptized by Pope Sylvester (he was really baptized by the Arian Bishop Eusebius), and cured by him of leprosy, to signify his gratitude, and as a recognition of the superiority of the Spiritual over the temporal Power, relinquished Rome to the Popes, bestowing on them for ever the Lateran Palace, as well as a large portion of Italy, including the Exarchate of Ravenna, Lombardy, Venetia, and Istria. To effect this, he founded Constantinople, and made it the new Capital of the Roman Empire. It states also, that "out of veneration to St. Peter the Emperor held the bridle of Pope Sylvester's horse," a custom which did not come into vogue till centuries afterwards.

The objects of the Forgery were to lower the prestige of the Metropolitans, in order to heighten that of the Popes; to exalt the Clergy, especially the suffragan Bishops; but beyond all to exalt the Popes as the *universal* Bishops, the law-givers and judges of the Churches.

The Forged Decretals did more than anything else to promote the triumph of the Papacy, and soon led to the extravagant pretences of the Popes. Before their appearance, Papal supremacy had been rather conceived than put into execution. But now Rome took a bolder flight; the Popes appealed to them as genuine, and quoted them as papal Rescripts, to determine disputed questions. Pope Hadrian I. adduced them in a letter to the Second Council of Nice; Pope Nicolas I., A.D. 864, who declared the judgment of Rome to be "the voice of God," quoted them in his contention with Archbishop Hincmar; and about A.D. 1151, Gratian made them the foundation of his Decretum, the great book of Canon Law during the Middle Ages.

Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims (although he was not unwill-

ing to use them himself when it suited him), and the Gallican Bishops, at once detected their spuriousness; but the imposition was not fully exposed till after the Revival of Learning in the Fifteenth Century, by the Magdeburg Centuriators (historians who divided their history of the Church, published at Magdeburg, and brought down to A.D. 1300, into *centuries*). Since then the Forgery has been universally admitted by leading Roman Catholics, but not till long after it had affected its object.

Whilst the temporal power of the Popes was founded by the donations of Pipin and Charlemagne, their Spiritual independence of the Eastern Emperors, against whom the Popes had from the first been in a state of chronic, if hitherto suppressed, rebellion, was consummated through their alliance with the Franks.

Pope Hadrian, dying A.D. 795, was succeeded by Leo III. (795—816). Four years after his election Leo was assaulted and left for dead by a band of conspirators, who had wished for the election of the nephew of the late Pope. Leo, however, recovered and fled to the Court of Charles, before whom he laid his grievances. Charles determined to hear his cause and the accusation brought against him by his enemies, for which purpose he entered Rome in December, A.D. 800. There he was received with the honours of a King and Patrician; the Pope was acquitted, and the sacrilegious conspirators were banished. And then followed one of the most important events in the history of Christendom, or it may be said of the World.

On Christmas-day of that year, Charlemagne, dressed in the habit of a Roman Patrician, attended Mass in St. Peter's; and whilst he was kneeling in prayer before the High Altar, the Pope suddenly, as if inspired by a heavenly impulse (although we are told that it was done with the consent of the Bishops and Priests and Senates, both of Rome and France, and the rest of the Christian people), placed a golden crown upon his head, in imitation of the Coronation of the Eastern Emperors by the

Patriarch of Constantinople. The dome of the Cathedral meanwhile resounded with the joyful acclamations of the multitudes within and outside the Church, "Long life and victory to the most pious Augustus, crowned by God, the great and pacific Emperor."

Thus was the Western Empire restored, and the King of the Franks was chosen to be the *Emperor of the Romans*, and, after the manner of the Cæsars, was *adored* by the Pope. The new Emperor, who throughout the proceeding had affected a passive attitude, affected surprise and displeasure; but there is little room for doubt that between the two principal actors there was a tacit understanding, although perhaps it was more sudden than the Emperor wished or expected. The preparations for the ceremony, the shouts of the multitude outside the Church, disclose the secret of a preconcerted arrangement. Probably, without the Pope, the transfer of the Empire could not have been effected. But Leo himself had not the power to make it, and was acting as the mouth-piece of the people; it was one result of the Iconoclastic Controversy, which had rendered the Italians as embittered against Constantinople, as was the Pope himself.

The proceeding was altogether illegal, and one of rebellion against his Suzerain, the Eastern Emperor, on the part of the Pope. The excuse pleaded was, that there was at the time no Emperor, but that the Empire was governed by a woman, Irene, who having circumvented her son by guile, and deprived him of his sight, had usurped the throne. It took place after the Council of Nice, by which the Images were restored, and a temporary reconciliation effected between Rome and Constantinople; but the memory of what Italy had suffered from the Iconoclasts, and the retention by the Eastern Patriarchs of the Diocese of Illyricum^f, still rankled, and the action of the Pope, if inexcusable, is at any rate intelligible.

^f See p. 349.

The Coronation of Charlemagne by the Pope was of the highest consequence to the Papacy. It was through the Pope that Rome again became the Capital of the Western Empire. The act was patent to all ; the Imperial Crown in the West was taken from the Greeks, and bestowed by the Pope on the Germans ; future Popes pointed to it as an indisputable fact ; they argued that it was for the Pope, as the Vicar of Christ, to bestow the Empire, and drew the conclusion that the power which could bestow could also take away the Crown. Thus arose "the Holy Roman Empire," or the Roman Empire of the German nation, the temporal Head of which was the German Emperor, the spiritual Head the Pope. There were thenceforward two Emperors, one in the East and the other in the West ; but Charles was held to be the lawful successor, not only of his Western, but also of his Eastern predecessors ; and from his time the Western Emperor was regarded as the Head of Christendom, which implied the Headship of the world. "Whilst," says Mr. Bryce, "the Eastern Princes paid a shameful tribute to the Mussulman, the Frankish Empire received from the Patriarch of Jerusalem the keys of the Holy Sepulchre, and the banner of Calvary," and (quoting Eginhard), he continues, "the gift of the Sepulchre itself, from Aaron, king of the Persians." Thus was laid the foundation of that fruitful cause of contention in the Middle Ages, of the Popes making and unmaking Emperors and Kings, at their will. And the coronation of Charlemagne at Rome, ignoring the Imperial line at Constantinople, matured, although it did not finally accomplish, the separation between Eastern and Western Christendom.

Two heresies which prevailed at the time when the Mahometan and Iconoclastic controversies were agitating the Church, must here be noticed.

Adoptionism, unlike the other heresies as to the Nature of our Lord which originated in the East, had its origin in the West, in the Saracen dominion of Spain. It was a new form of

Nestorianism. The Council of Toledo, the Metropolitan See of Spain, A.D. 675, had declared that Christ is the Son of God, not by Adoption, but by Nature. But in the latter end of the Eighth Century two Spanish Bishops, Elipand of Toledo, and Felix of Urgel, taught that Christ as to His Divinity was the Son of God, but in His Human Nature He was Son by *adoption* into Sonship with God. The orthodox view was, and is, that the Nature of Christ is Indivisible, that the Virgin Mary gave birth to the Son of God, and hence is called the Mother of God. Pope Hadrian wrote, A.D. 785, to the Bishops of Spain, warning them against the new doctrine as Nestorianism; the heresy spread into France; the Council of Frankfort (A.D. 794), under Charlemagne, condemned it as a heresy which "ought to be utterly rooted out;" other Synods condemned it; Alcuin bore an important part in the controversy, and at the request of Charlemagne wrote a treatise against it. Felix professed to be convinced of his error; he afterwards reaffirmed it, and again recanted, but finally died in his heresy, A.D. 818. Elipand continued openly to advocate it; but it finally died a natural death about the middle of the Ninth Century.

The other heresy, that of the Paulicians, a name assumed from St. Paul, on whom they proposed to base their religion, sprang up in Armenia about A.D. 660, their founder being Constantine, a native of that country. He, and his followers after his death, assumed the names of the companions of St. Paul, he himself taking the name of Silvanus, whilst others called themselves Timothy, Titus, Epaphroditus, and Tychichus. Their heresy was a reproduction of the Gnostic Dualism, that there were two Gods, one the god of darkness, the Creator of the World, and the God of the Old Testament; the other they worshipped as the Supreme God, and the God of the spiritual world. Being followers of St. Paul, they thought it necessary to reject St. Peter, the Apostle of the Circumcision, the adversary of St. Paul, the denier of Christ.

The Gospel of St. Luke, the companion of St. Paul, they held in the highest reverence; the Apocalypse they ignored. They taught that Christ's Body was not born of the substance of the Virgin Mary; His Human Nature was brought from Heaven; His Birth was only ideal; but that His mission was to redeem mankind from the power of evil. They denied the perpetual virginity of St. Mary; rejected the Sacraments; abjured everything approaching to Ritual; to pay reverence to the Cross was gross superstition; the title of *Christians* they confined to themselves, calling the Catholics *Romans*.

They were from the first treated with cruel severity. Their founder, Constantine, was seized by order of Constantine Pogonatus, and was stoned to death (A.D. 684). Simeon, who was sent to execute the judgment, and afterwards joined the Paulicians, was burnt by order of the Emperor Justinian II., as a Manichæan. They professed an abhorrence of Images, yet for a hundred and fifty years they were the victims of every Emperor, Image-worshipper and Iconoclast alike; till, A.D. 844, the Empress Theodora, thinking thus to exterminate the heresy, caused one hundred thousand of them in Western Armenia to be put to death. The remainder of the sect found an asylum amongst the Saracens, in alliance with whom they made successful war on the Provinces of the Empire; and A.D. 867, made with their allies a successful attack upon Ephesus, and stabled their horses in the Cathedral.

CHAPTER XI.

THE SCHISM BETWEEN EAST AND WEST.

CHARLEMAGNE'S Claims to be Head of the Church—His Capitularies—Coronation of his son Louis the Pious—St. Benedict of Aniane—High views of Louis as to his Supremacy—Growing claims of the Popes—Louis does Penance at Attigny—Wars between Louis and his sons—The Lügenfeld—Lothaire, Emperor—Battle of Fontenoy—Treaty of Verdun—France and Germany constituted two distinct Kingdoms—Louis II. holds the Bridle of the Pope's horse—Hincmar of Rheims and Pope Nicolas I.—Nicolas and Lothaire II.—Formosus, Bishop of Porto, excommunicated—Ignatius and Photius, Patriarchs of Constantinople—Action of Pope Nicolas—Nicolas and Photius excommunicate each other—Conversion of Bulgaria—Formosus, the excommunicated Bishop of Porto, becomes Pope—His dead body exhumed, judged, and mutilated by Stephen VI.—The Decrees against him rescinded by John IX.—The Dark Age of the Papacy—Otto the Great, Emperor—Deposes Pope John XII.—Otto II. and III.—Boniface VII., the supposed murderer of two Popes, becomes Pope—Gerbert, Pope—Benedict IX., a boy ten years of age, Pope—Three Popes at the same time—Deposed by the Emperor, Henry III.—He reforms the Papacy—Bruno appointed Pope as Leo IX.—Hildebrand—Leo reforms the Church—Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople—Charges brought by him against the Roman Church—Leo excommunicates the Eastern Church, and Cerularius retaliates on the Western Church—The Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem make common cause with Constantinople—Thus the great Schism between East and West—Leo takes the field against the Normans—Is made prisoner, but afterwards liberated—His death in St. Peter's at Rome.

Two inevitable results of the coronation of Charlemagne by the Pope were only a matter of time ; one a death-struggle between the Western Emperors and the Popes ; the other the separation of the Eastern and Western Churches.

Never was the supremacy of the Civil Ruler over the Church, as well as over the State, more rigorously asserted than by Charlemagne. First as King of the Franks, and afterwards as Emperor, he determined to maintain his rights in matters Ecclesiastical as well as Civil. The Pope (such was his theory)

was Head of the Church, but the divinely appointed Cæsar was Head of the whole Kingdom and of the Empire. In all controversies of the day ; in the question of Images ; in regulating the offices of the Church ; and in minute enquiries into the morality and capability of the Clergy, he acted on his own authority, and enforced their duties on Bishops and Abbots. When King of the Franks (and he was not likely to take a lower view after he became Emperor), he withstood the Pope, whom he condemned as acting wrongly in accepting the decrees of the Second Council of Nice ; he took the Englishman Alcuin, and not the Pope, as his guide ; and in the Council of Frankfort, which he himself convened, over which, though Papal Legates were present, he himself presided, settled the usages of the Western Church. Nay, to such a degree did he carry his authority as to earn for himself the title of "Episcopus Episcoporum." His *Capitularies* drawn up at Aix-la-Chapelle (A.D. 802), remain a monument of his intentions ; whilst the rights of the Church are protected, his own rights of ecclesiastical control are maintained, and discipline enforced by penal laws.

Nothing was further from his intention than that the Popes should be exalted beyond their legitimate sphere within the Church. By his Coronation oath the Emperor had bound himself to observe the rights of the Church, but he had not bound himself to recognise any special Supremacy of the Pope. The Pope had to do homage to the new Empire, or, as already stated, to go through the ceremony of *adoring* the Emperor. The election of the Pope required the Confirmation of the Emperor, to whom he, like any other subject, took an oath of fidelity ; if their opinions clashed, the ultimate control rested with the Emperor, from whose judgment there was no appeal.

Thus Charlemagne in reviving the Western Empire had intended that the Emperors should control the Popes ; instead of that, the Popes soon came to control the Emperors.

The stability of Charlemagne's Empire depended on his own life.

He did not exercise the gift of looking into futurity, or he would have foreseen the danger that would inevitably result from his leaving the prerogatives of the Popes undefined and indistinct. He does not seem to have considered how his system depended on a succession of able Rulers like himself. Under a strong successor, the Popes would not have aspired to the idea of shaking off the ties which bound them to the Emperor, or if they did, they would have failed. Nor at present were the Popes even in a position to stand without the Emperor; we have seen how, as recently as A.D. 798, in a sedition which broke out in Rome, the Pope, Leo I., in danger of his life from the citizens of Rome, was obliged to throw himself upon the protection of Charles.

In 813 Charlemagne declared his son Louis, afterwards surnamed the *Pious*, and le Débonnaire (*good-natured*), at that time thirty-six years of age, his successor in the Empire. Not apparently considering the intervention of the Pope necessary, he ordered Louis to approach the Altar in the Church of Aix-la-Chapelle, and to take from it the Crown, "as a gift which he held from God, his father, and the nation," and to place it on his own head; meaning to signify by the act that he derived his title not from Coronation by the Pope, but directly from God. Charlemagne by this contrivance certainly did exercise a kind of presage of the latent claims of the Papacy.

He died on January 28, A.D. 814, at the age of seventy years, and was buried in the Basilica which he had himself built at Aix-la-Chapelle, on the model of the Church at Jerusalem, adorning it with treasures of art brought from Rome and Ravenna. He was never really canonised—his life, which was not marked by strict morality, nor conjugal fidelity, forbade this—yet his name appears in the Catalogue of Saints, and many Churches were built and dedicated to the memory of St. Charlemagne.

Two of Charlemagne's sons died before him, Pipin, A.D. 810, leaving an illegitimate son, named Bernard, and Charles, A.D. 811.

His son Louis (814—840) succeeded him. He had not his father's faults, neither had he inherited his father's talents, although as King of Aquitaine, which he held in Charlemagne's life-time, he had exhibited considerable bravery against the Saracens. The name *Pious* which is ascribed to him shows the estimation in which he was held. Gentle-minded with his bravery, learned and deeply religious, he had shown himself the supporter of all that was good, and the munificent benefactor of Churches and Convents in his kingdom ; virtues which were counterbalanced by weakness of character and superstition.

Louis would have preferred the monastic life to that of Emperor. His principal adviser was a rigorous monk, St. Benedict of Aniane (774—821), or, to call him by the name of his birth, Witiza, (son of a Count of Languedoc,) who is regarded as the second Founder of Monasticism in the Frankish Kingdom. Assuming the name of St. Benedict of Nursia, whose system he found had become relaxed, whilst many vices had crept into the monasteries, he aimed at introducing into them a stricter Rule and more rigid discipline than had been adopted by his namesake. In 782 he built a monastery at Aniane which contained a thousand monks ; but he was transferred thence by Louis to Aix-la-Chapelle, with the general superintendence of the Benedictine monasteries throughout his dominions.

Acting under such an adviser, Louis could not but be scandalised with the licentiousness which, as regards both the Clergy and laity, had become prevalent during the latter years of his father, and was introduced into the Court itself. Nine wives divorced one after another do not reflect credit on the morality of Charlemagne's private life. Louis at once banished from the Court persons of notoriously evil reputation, even his own sisters, who from their association with their paramours, were far from models of virtue.

Like his father, he had high views of his own Supremacy, in Spiritual as well as in Civil matters. In regulating the matters

of the Church, and in the reformation of the Monasteries, he acted on his own authority, without reference to the Pope ; and in order to effect the changes which he thought necessary, he held two Councils at Aix-la-Chapelle (A.D. 816 and 817).

Still after Charles' death the Popes assumed a new attitude, and took advantage of the weakness of the Imperial power, engaging with the plenitude of authority in the contest which took place amongst his descendants. The Popes had thenceforward two objects constantly in view ; one to shake off the confirmation of their election by the Emperors ; the other to assert their own authority in confirming the Imperial elections. Louis, together with his wife, underwent a second coronation at the hands of Stephen IV. (816—817), the successor of Leo. That was an act of the greatest importance to the Papacy, and from that time the government of the Church (and not long afterwards that of the Empire) underwent a complete change. Yet Louis does not seem to have understood his own mind ; for, after the second Council at Aix-la-Chapelle, he himself with his own hands crowned his son Lothaire as his colleague in the Empire, as if to show that the Imperial dignity was not derived from the Pope, but from the Nation, through the Emperor. But, from this time forward, the Popes claimed, as Vicars of Christ, to crown the Emperors, and the opinion became established that the highest dignity on earth could only be conferred by God Himself through the successor of St. Peter.

Stephen IV. began a new precedent, by being consecrated without regard to the Emperor's confirmation. Still he thought it necessary to excuse himself to Louis, on the ground that the hasty consecration was necessitated by the popular tumults which at that time agitated Rome. This, however, did not prevent the same course being adopted by the next Pope, Paschal I. (817—824) ; again the same excuse was pleaded, but this time the Romans were warned not to repeat the offence.

Louis and his eldest son, Lothaire (840—855), were now joint Emperors; Louis appointed his two younger sons, Pipin and Louis, the former to rule over Aquitaine, the latter over Germany; whence he was called Louis the German. His nephew Bernard he continued in the government of Italy, to which he had been before appointed by Charlemagne.

Pope Paschal was believed to have countenanced an ambitious design of Bernard, in 817, to make Italy independent of the Frankish Monarchy. The Imperial cause, however, gained an easy victory, and the rising was piteously suppressed; Louis pleaded that Bernard's life should be spared; sterner counsellors, however, prevailed; his eyes were put out, and he died of a broken heart a few days afterwards. More than once his sensitive heart smote Louis for the cruel deed. At a great Diet at Attigny, near Laon, A.D. 822, dressed in the garb of a penitent, he humbled himself, in the presence of his Bishops and Nobles, to a voluntary penance for the part he had borne (and that was in reality only in mitigation of the sentence), in the death of his nephew.

The great and, for the remainder of his life, unending calamities of Louis now began, and the Empire which Charlemagne had founded to break up. With the Civil Wars which ensued, in which the Bishops and Abbots took a prominent part, we are only so far concerned as they display the growing powers of the Papacy, and the influence which the Popes now began to exercise over the Empire.

Louis having been left a widower (A.D. 818) by the death of the Empress Ermenburga, was disposed to resign his Crown, and seek refuge from the world in a Monastery. Being, however, dissuaded by the Clergy, he in the following year married Judith, the high-born and beautiful daughter of Welf, Count of Altorf, who (A.D. 823) bore him a son, afterwards known as Charles the Bald, whom his parents naturally wished to put on an equality with Louis' other sons. This, however, excited

the jealousy of the others, especially Lothaire, who, equally naturally, objected to a further sub-division of the Empire. On Easter-day, A.D. 823, Lothaire, who, on the death of Bernard, had succeeded him on the throne of Italy, was crowned anew by Pope Paschal, who induced him to believe that the Empire could only be conferred by the Pope. But Lothaire, who was quite as determined as his father and grandfather to uphold his own supremacy, exacted from every Roman an oath of fealty, and bound them not to allow any Pope to be consecrated until he had sworn allegiance to the Emperor in the presence of his commissioners; thus reserving to the Emperor the right of enquiring into the elections, and deciding on the merits of the candidates.

On the death of Paschal a contest for the Papacy occurred, Lothaire exercising his authority as King of Italy for the candidate who eventually proved successful, and succeeded as Pope Eugenius II. (824—827). On the death of Eugenius, Valentinus, and in the same year Gregory IV. (827—844), a Roman, became Pope through the influence of Lothaire.

In 829 Louis bestowed part of the dominions held by his son Louis the German, on the young Charles, a boy only six years of age. This led to a rebellion in the next year of the three eldest sons against their father, who, together with his wife and young son, was imprisoned, but, owing to dissensions between the three brothers, almost immediately released.

The three eldest sons again rebelled, A.D. 833, and the rebellion was encouraged by Pope Gregory, who joined their camp against their father. But when Gregory threatened the Emperor with excommunication, the Bishops, who were adherents of the Emperor, retaliated by threatening to excommunicate the Pope, and to depose him from the Papacy. From this it appears that the Provincial Bishops did not think it essential to be in communion with the Pope. The Bishops, however, themselves soon fell away from their allegiance to the

Emperor, who was thus reduced to the greatest distress, and left to the mercy of his unnatural sons. The scene of the disgraceful transactions which followed was afterwards known as the Lügenfeld, *the Field of Lies*. The Pope having first taken the part of the sons against their father, afterwards assumed the place of mediator between the two parties ; but being unsuccessful, returned, it is said with a feeling of remorse for the unworthy part which he had taken, to Rome.

The Emperor, with his wife and young son, were now committed to a prison near Soissons. In a Diet summoned by Lothaire, the rebel Bishops pronounced a sentence of deposition, and compelled the Emperor, in the presence of Lothaire, to do penance in the Cathedral. But now the saintly character of Louis, and the degradation to which the Bishops had subjected the Empire, caused a reaction in his favour. The two younger of the three sons embraced the cause of their father, and Lothaire was forced to fly into Burgundy. The Bishops renewed their allegiance, and the Emperor was publicly reinstated in the Empire on March 1, A.D. 834. The remaining years of his life were distracted by the feuds of his sons, till his death occurred on March 1, A.D. 840, in a Castle on the Rhine, and he was buried at Metz. His son Pipin had died before him (A.D. 838).

Soon after the death of Louis the disintegration of the Empire was completed. France fell to the share of his son Charles, Germany to Louis, the rest of the empire to Lothaire, with the capitals of Aix-la-Chapelle and Rome. But Lothaire claimed the whole inheritance as his father and grandfather had left it. He was, however, defeated by his brothers in the battle of Fontenoy near Auxerre, A.D. 841, in which not far short of sixty thousand men fell, and the Empire underwent a further partition by the treaty of Verdun, A.D. 843. The treaty effected a permanent division of the Empire into two kingdoms, destined to become rivals, those of France and Germany, Charles the Bald taking Neustria and Aquitaine (or

what may be called France), whilst Louis the German, or, to call him by his German name, Ludvig, took Austrasia, including all the land and nations East of the Rhine. The two capitals Aix-la-Chapelle and Rome, with Italy and Holland, and the country which after his name was called Lotharingia (modernised into Lorraine), went to the Emperor Lothaire. France, which was to remain not German, but Latin, with a Latin and not German language, rejected the half-Teutonic line of the Carolingians, and selected the Kings of Paris from its own chieftains.

From the Treaty of Verdun, A.D. 843, modern Germany dates its national existence, and A.D. 1843 celebrated its thousandth anniversary. Once again, for a short time, the German and Western Kingdoms were united under Charles the Fat (Emperor 884—887), son of Louis the German, who, through failure of the collateral branches, succeeded to the whole inheritance. His short and inglorious reign ended in his deposition (A.D. 887), and on his death in the following year the two parts again fell asunder. The Germans chose Arnulf, an illegitimate descendant of the Carolingian line; and the male line of Charlemagne in Germany ended, A.D. 911, in the grandson of Arnulf, Louis the Child.

The chieftains and people then chose Conrad I., of Franconia (911—918), and after him Henry, a Saxon Duke (918—936), surnamed the Fowler, both of them born in the female line of Charlemagne. His son and successor was Otto the Great (936—973), who, says Mr. Bryce, was the second founder of the Western Empire. Under him the Holy Roman Empire took the form which it bore in later centuries, as denoting the sovereignty of Germany and Italy under a German Prince. Under Otto, Germany definitely took the place which it was to occupy in the world and over the Church in the Middle and later ages.

The above digression was necessary in order to unravel the

tangled history of the time, and to understand the future history of the Church.

Meanwhile the Forged Decretals had been freely used by the Popes, who were by their aid enabled to advance their growing pretensions.

On the death of Pope Gregory IV., 844, an Antipope, John, having been elected, but soon afterwards driven out, Sergius II. (844—847) was, without his election receiving the Imperial confirmation, appointed Pope. Next after him followed Leo IV. (847—855), who also was consecrated without the confirmation of the Emperor; the excuse, however, that an imminent attack on Rome by the Saracens rendered a hurried consecration necessary, was pleaded, and accepted by the Emperor.

Between him and the next Pope, Benedict III. (855—858), occurs the fable of the female Pope, Joanna (Joanna Papessa), or Pope Joan, which although for many centuries believed, is now discredited, and needs only mention to be dismissed. After the death of Benedict, another Antipope, Anastasius (August—September, 858), was chosen, but was soon expelled, and Nicolas I. (858—867), surnamed the Great, consecrated. Soon after his Consecration, when the Pope was on his way to visit the Emperor Louis II., the Emperor, proceeding a mile on the road to meet him, and holding the bridle of his horse, walked by his side, as the Forged Decretals insisted that Constantine had done for Pope Sylvester. Under Nicolas, the Decretals began to do their work, and the full theory of Papal grandeur, in rendering both Temporal and Spiritual jurisdiction subject to the Pope, gave a foretaste of its future development.

At first his claims over the independence of their National Church, and the rights of the Crown, met with strong opposition from the Gallican Metropolitans, who, whilst they expressed their willingness to acquiesce in the authority given to the Pope by the Council of Sardica, refused to go any further. The most influential of their number was Hincmar, Archbishop

of Rheims, probably the most learned of the Western Bishops of the time, who was the first victim of the Decretals. Born A.D. 805 of a noble family, he became a Monk in the Monastery of St. Denys, and was A.D. 845 appointed to the See of Rheims, the See once held by St. Remigius, in the Cathedral of which the kings of France used to be consecrated. In 863 Hincmar deposed one of his Suffragans, Rothald, Bishop of Soissons, notwithstanding that he had appealed to Pope Nicolas. Hincmar admitted that in certain cases an appeal to Rome was allowable, but denied it in the present case. The Pope, who had been before contented to take his stand on the Council of Sardica, now took fresh ground on the Forged Decretals, and ordered Hincmar to reinstate the deposed Bishop. Hincmar, although he pleaded that the action of the Pope was irregular and uncanonical, yielded.

Nicolas, as we shall see presently, relying on the Decretals excommunicated Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople; but in that case he met with a man as determined and ambitious as himself, who retaliated by excommunicating the Pope.

Lothaire II., King of Lotharingia, and son of the Emperor Lothaire I., having (A.D. 857) divorced his wife, Theulberga, whom he had married in the previous year, and taken another wife, Waldrada, Nicolas compelled him to take back his former wife, and excommunicated Waldrada; and, when afterwards he had determined to excommunicate the King himself, he was only prevented by death from issuing the sentence. In this case, as was frequently the case afterwards, the interference of the Popes was exercised in a good cause.

But after Nicolas, one of the most able of the Popes, had thus given a sanction to the Decretals, as if they were genuine, succeeding Popes were not backward in following the example. Hadrian II. (867—872), an old man, seventy-five years of age, succeeded as Pope without confirmation of the Imperial Ambassadors, who happened to be at that time in Rome, being

obtained or requested; the Ambassadors complained; the Romans made excuses, and their excuses were again accepted.

In his Pontificate an acrimonious dispute arose between Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, and his nephew, Hincmar, Bishop of Laon. The elder Hincmar had (A.D. 858) obtained for his nephew, although he seems to have been under the Canonical age, the See of Laon. The character of the younger Hincmar, who at once set at nought his Metropolitan authority, soon gave the uncle cause for repenting of the appointment. When, in consequence of a dispute with Charles the Bald, King of France, the nephew was deprived of his Episcopal income, the Archbishop was inclined to stand by him. On that occasion the young Hincmar was allowed to recover the revenues of his See.

But fresh difficulties, owing to the irregularities of the nephew, having soon again sprung up between the Archbishop and Bishop, the former was obliged to condemn his violent proceedings; whereupon the insubordinate nephew, on the strength of the Forged Decretals, appealed to the Pope. He was in consequence deposed in a Synod of Gallican Bishops at Douay (A.D. 871), who determined to assert the rights of their National Church. Hadrian then summoned the opposing parties to appear before him, to have the case judged in Rome. But Charles the Bald espoused the cause of the Metropolitan and the Bishops, and a threatening letter was written in his name, condemning the language and conduct of the Pope as unbecoming a Bishop, whilst at the same time he denied the Pope's right to receive the appeal. The Pope had reasons for standing well with Charles, to whom he wrote a conciliatory letter, and the matter was soon afterwards ended by the Pope's death.

The Papacy, however, was, as usual, the gainer. Although the Gallican Bishops had refused to be bound by the Decretals, no open opposition to them was published, whilst the appeal to the Pope was a known fact, and was brought into greater prominence than before. The power of the Papacy was

so enhanced, that the Gallican Bishops found it to their advantage to have the Pope as their ally. Both Bishops and Princes now saw, says Canon Robertson, in the Papacy something that might be used to their advantage; but the benefit of every application to Rome was sure to redound to the Papal See itself.

Hadrian II. was succeeded by John VIII. (872—882), who approved the course taken by Hincmar of Rheims with respect to his disorderly nephew. Formosus, Bishop of Porto, had the misfortune to offend the Pope. He had been employed by Pope Nicolas as his Legate to Bulgaria, whence he was called the *Apostle of the Bulgarians*. His present offence probably consisted in his desiring, in opposition to the Pope, to gratify the request of the Bulgarians that their Church should be raised into a Metropolitan See. John VIII. espoused the cause of Charles the Bald, King of France, and in 875 crowned him as Emperor (875—877), excommunicating Formosus who opposed the election, and depriving him of the See of Porto. The Papacy was thus brought into nearer connection with the Kings of France, and in return for his zeal, the Emperor made the Pope's cause his own. He sanctioned the appointment of a Papal Vicar in France and Germany, and surrendered the control which the Emperors had hitherto exercised in the election of a Pope. In a Council held at Ravenna (A.D. 877), the principles advocated in the Forged Decretals were carried out; the privileges of Metropolitans lowered, and the power of the Suffragan Bishops raised to a height hitherto unknown. Thus in the Pontificate of John, the sphere of Papal power was considerably enlarged. John's action in the case of the Patriarch Photius will be mentioned later on in this Chapter.

In 882 John died a violent death, and in the same year Hincmar of Rheims died.

John was succeeded by Marinus (882—884), who, Platina says, was a Frenchman, his real name being Martin. He was

said to have already been a Bishop when he was elected Pope ; his election therefore was against the Nicene Canon, which forbids the Translation of a Bishop from one See to another. Marinus removed the sentence of excommunication against Formosus, and released him from an oath, by which he had bound himself, never again to enter Rome.

The next Pope, Hadrian III. (884—885), decreed that the Election of the Popes should be independent of the Emperors.

The Election of his successor, Stephen V. (885—891), who was consecrated by Formosus, the restored Bishop of Porto, was conducted without reference to the Emperor. This Pope asserted that "The whole Church throughout the World is governed by the decrees of the Roman Pontiff."

It will thus be seen to what a great height the Papacy had been exalted since, and in consequence of, the Forged Decretals.

We must now go back to the History of the Eastern Empire, which was broken off after the victory gained over the Iconoclasts by the Empress Theodora, the mother of the worthless Emperor Michael.

Michael, weary of the control of his mother, threw off, at the age of eighteen, all restraint, and under the influence of his maternal uncle Bardas, whose ambition led him to encourage his depravity, gave way to the lowest vices, one of his favourite amusements being, in company with his dissolute companions, to mimic the holiest functions of the Church. During his reign occurred one of those unhappy dissensions between East and West, the constant recurrence of which brought nearer the inevitable Schism.

On the death of Methodius (A.D. 846), after holding the Patriarchal See for four years, Ignatius (846—857, and again 867—877), a man of gentle and pious character, who, when Abbot of a Monastery, had exchanged the name of Nicetas for his *religious* name, was appointed by Theodora to succeed him. He

was a man of illustrious birth, his mother, Procopia, being a daughter of the Emperor Nicephorus (802—811), whilst his father was the Emperor Michael (811—813), who was surnamed Rhangabe. In 857 Ignatius felt it his duty to refuse the Holy Eucharist to Bardas, whose scandalous life laid him open to the censures of the Church ; whilst he also opposed him in his scheme for forcing Theodora and her daughters into a Monastery. Bardas, who had now gained a complete ascendancy over the Emperor, prevailed with him to banish the Patriarch to the Island of Terebinthus, and to consign Theodora and her daughters, who opposed their wicked designs, to a Monastery. By way of appeasing the indignation of the populace, Bardas obtained the appointment of Photius (857—867, and again 877—886), a layman of a distinguished family, and nephew of the late Patriarch Tarasius, and reputed to be the most learned Greek of the time, to the Patriarchate. Photius, though undoubtedly an ambitious man, reluctantly accepted the See which was conferred upon him by such unworthy patrons as Michael and Bardas, and the vacancy in which was caused by the deposition of Ignatius.

Photius, like his predecessor, was a favourer of the Images. He received the different Orders of the Ministry at the hands of Gregory, Bishop of Syracuse, who having been driven from his Diocese by the Saracens, happened to be in Constantinople at the time, but who had been the opponent of Ignatius ever since the appointment of the latter to the Patriarchate. To the deposition of Ignatius, and the consecration of Photius in his place, is to be ascribed the penultimate stage, which ended in the great Schism between East and West.

There were now in the Imperial City two opposite parties, the followers of Ignatius and the followers of Photius ; the former excommunicated Photius as a usurper, and Photius, a man of somewhat irascible temper, excommunicated Ignatius. Photius announced his election to the Pope, Nicolas I., informing him at

the same time that the Emperor, and Bishops, and Clergy, had forced on him against his own entreaties, and in spite of his tears, the unwelcome burden. The Emperor Michael also wrote to the Pope, who, in his answer, seized the opportunity of redemanding the dominions in Illyricum and Calabria, of which the Roman See had been deprived in the reign of Leo the Isaurian. On the strength of the Forged Decretals, he protested against the deposition of Ignatius, without Rome being consulted; and he at the same time wrote to Photius that his Legates would enquire into and report to him as to the validity of his hurried Ordination.

The Emperor, indignant at the Pope's letter, treated the Legates as insolent subjects, and imprisoned them. Ignatius was summoned by the Pope to appear before a Synod held in Constantinople (A.D. 862), which the two Papal Legates, Rodvald, Bishop of Porto, and Zacharias, Bishop of Anagni, together with three hundred and eighteen Bishops (the same number which was present at the First Council of Nice) attended. The Legates also received instruction to deal with the question of the Images. The Synod confirmed the deposition of Ignatius, in which the Papal Legates acquiesced; and, by way of propitiating the Pope, condemned Iconoclasm. Ignatius, cruelly treated and beaten, and rendered by his sufferings and by starvation scarcely conscious of what he did, traced the sign of the Cross in subscription of his own condemnation.

A terrible earthquake, which devastated Constantinople for forty days together after the Council, alarmed the Emperor and Bardas, and the terrified citizens accounted it as a just retribution for the persecution of Ignatius. Ignatius, having in consequence obtained his liberty, was enabled to draw up a petition to the Pope, which, signed by ten Metropolitans, fifteen Bishops, and a large number of Priests and Monks, was conveyed to Rome by Theognostus, an Abbot of Constantinople.

The acts of the late Council were also sent to the Pope,

together with a letter from Photius, who wrote as the Pope's equal, ignoring the Forged Decretals ; lamenting his exchange of the quiet and peaceful life of a layman for the turbulent one of an ecclesiastic ; and defending the canonical character of his appointment to the See of Constantinople by the similar cases of some of his predecessors, but with particular reference to the case of St. Ambrose ^a.

The Pope, after the return of the Legates and the receipt of the letter of Photius, disowned the part which they had taken, and declared that he had given them no commission for the deposition of Ignatius, or the appointment of Photius. In letters to the Emperor and Photius he took the highest ground ever yet taken by a Pope, that the Church of Rome was the Head of all Churches, on which all depend ; he stated that Ignatius was the rightful Patriarch of Constantinople, and that the appointment of Photius, whom he addressed as a layman, was irregular. After a Synod at Rome (A.D. 862) he declared Photius to be deposed, annulled his Orders, and threatened to excommunicate him in case of disobedience. He sent a third letter addressed to the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and to their Metropolitans and Bishops, condemning the action of his Legates ; " We command you," it said, " by the Apostolical authority, to agree with us with regard to Ignatius and Photius, and to publish this letter in your Dioceses, that it may become known to all."

In another Council at Rome in the next year Nicolas pronounced an anathema against Photius, and against Gregory his consecrator, and restored Ignatius ; " We, through the power committed to us by our Lord through St. Peter, restore our brother Ignatius to his See, and all the honours of his Patriarchate."

The Emperor and Photius treated the Anathema of the Pope with indifference, and Photius continued to hold the See. The

^a See p. 187.

Emperor wrote to Nicolas that he never intended in his former communication to admit the Pope as a judge of his affairs, and spoke of the Latin language, in which the Pope wrote, as "a barbarous jargon." In reply, the Pope charged him with disrespect towards God's Priests and towards the Pope, who derived his authority from St. Peter; he advised him to cease calling himself "Emperor of the Romans," and to abstain from abusing the Roman Language; he warned him of the fate of former Emperors, Nero, Diocletian, Constantius, Anastasius, who had persecuted the Church.

In 866 Bardas suffered death for conspiring against the Emperor.

Photius, who was determined to assert the independence of his Patriarchate of the See of Rome, invited the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem to meet him in a Council at Constantinople. The Council assembled A.D. 867. Photius excommunicated Pope Nicolas, and the other Patriarchs joined him in the sentence. Photius insisted that the Roman Church had departed in several matters from Primitive discipline, such as the observing Saturday as a Fast; forbidding the Clergy to marry; the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son; the shaving of their beards by the Clergy. The Decrees of the Council were signed by the Emperor Michael, by Basil the Macedonian, whom the Emperor had crowned as Cæsar, by the three Eastern Patriarchs, by nearly a thousand Bishops and Abbots, and by the highest officers of the Eastern Empire.

In the same year in which the Council was held, a revolution in the Palace, followed by a revolution in the Church, occurred at Constantinople. Basil the Macedonian had endeavoured in some measure to restrain the debaucheries of his colleague. Michael, unwilling to submit to the restraint, ordered, when under a fit of intoxication, the execution of Basil. Basil, finding that it was with him a matter of life or death, ordered the murder of Michael: after which he himself became sole Emperor

(867—886), and was thus the founder of the Macedonian dynasty of the Eastern Emperors.

Two days afterwards Photius was deposed, and Ignatius reinstated in the Patriarchate. Hadrian II. (867—872) had now succeeded Nicolas as Pope, and by him, in a Council at Rome, the deposition of Photius was confirmed, and all the Ordinations conferred by him annulled. The victory of Rome was consummated at a Council of Constantinople, A.D. 869, which the Roman Church dignifies as the Eighth General Council. Two Bishops from Rome attended it, the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem sending their representatives. Photius, as well as all Heretics and Iconoclasts, were anathematised.

Photius was now in his turn sent into exile, and Ignatius was left in peaceful possession of the Patriarchate for ten years.

Meanwhile another element had been poured into the already overflowing cup of discord between the Eastern and Western Churches, arising out of the Conversion of Bulgaria. During the Regency of the Empress Theodora, Bogoris, the King of that country, had been instructed in the doctrines of Christianity by a Monk from Constantinople, who had fallen a captive into his hands. Soon afterwards, at a time when his country was suffering from a severe famine, Bogoris, after having sought in vain the assistance of his own gods, determined to invoke the God of the Christians. His prayer having been answered by the desired result, Bogoris received Baptism from the Patriarch, probably Photius, of Constantinople, the Emperor Michael, whose name he took in exchange for his own, standing as Godfather.

Soon afterwards Bogoris (or Michael as he was now called), who seems to have had some wavering doubt on the subject, applied to Pope Nicolas for further instruction. The Pope seized on the opportunity for asserting the superior authority of his own See, and on the ground that Constantinople was not a See of Apostolical foundation, sent his own Missionaries into Bulgaria, and prevailed upon the Bulgarians to expel the Greek,

and accept the Roman mission. But both the rival Patriarchs of Constantinople, Photius and Ignatius, were at one in holding that Bulgaria, having owed its conversion to Constantinople, owed its allegiance to that See and not to Rome. The matter having been brought before the Council of 869, and settled in favour of Constantinople, the Bulgarians thereupon returned to their first allegiance, and the Romans were driven from the country. Constantinople thus gained the victory ; but the sore rankled, and was one more cause which led to the final Schism of East and West.

On the death of Ignatius, A.D. 877 (he has been canonised by the Roman Church), at the age of nearly eighty years, Photius was re-instated in his See by the Emperor Basil. He announced his re-instatement to John VIII. (872—882), who had succeeded Hadrian as Pope. The Pope construing this as an act of submission on the part of Photius, approved the restoration, and sent to him the Insignia of a Patriarch. Another Council was held, A.D. 879, at Constantinople, which the Greeks call the Eighth General Council ; three hundred and eighteen Eastern Bishops, with two Legates from the Pope, and representatives of the other Patriarchs, attended under the Presidency of Photius. Photius successfully defended his position ; the Council ratified his restoration, and the Papal Legates joined in anathematising the Council of 869. The Roman claims over Bulgaria were disallowed.

When John learnt the decisions of the Council, he was more enraged, even than his predecessor had been, against Photius, whom, with all those who recognised him as Patriarch, he anathematised, and the Anathema was renewed by his three successors. Photius being again deposed by the son and successor of Basil, Leo VI. (886—911), who was dignified by the title of *the Philosopher*, died in exile, A.D. 891. By his death, the schism of more than thirty years standing was apparently healed, and a kind of approximation effected between the

Churches of Rome and Constantinople. But it was only on the surface ; their differences were too numerous and too deeply seated to be thus eradicated, and the breach was only postponed till A.D. 1053.

At the end of the Ninth Century the Popes were often appointed and again removed, by violence, sometimes they were condemned by their successors or by Councils. Formosus (891—896), a man of considerable learning, was notwithstanding his excommunication by Pope John VIII., under violent opposition appointed Pope. Formosus had been Bishop of Porto, so the translation was in violation of the Canon of the Nicene Council. Boniface VI. (May—June, 896), the next Pope, was a man of such notoriously profligate life, that he had formerly been degraded from the Priesthood, and was so wicked a Pope that Baronius refuses to acknowledge his short Pontificate.

Next came Stephen VI. (896—897), a man of equally scandalous character, who, not content with condemning Formosus in a Synod, avenged a long-standing grudge, by having his body exhumed and subjected to a trial. Seated on a Papal chair, and dressed in its Pontifical robes, a Deacon being appointed as Defender, the lifeless form was accused of having been uncanonically translated from the See of Porto to Rome. The vestments were torn off ; the three fingers which had been used in giving the Benediction cut off ; and the mutilated body then thrown into the Tiber, whilst all the Orders which he had conferred were annulled. Romanus, the next Pope to Stephen, only reigned for four months, and Theodore II. for only a few weeks. Under their successor, John IX. (898—900), all the decrees against Formosus were rescinded in a Roman Synod, A.D. 898. But the disgraceful contest was long kept up between the supporters and opponents of Formosus. This Synod also laid down the rules to be observed in the election of the Popes. The voice of the people was to be heard ; but the Bishops and

Clergy were to elect, and the Pope was to be consecrated in the presence of the Imperial Ambassadors.

It might be supposed that at the end of the Ninth Century the Papacy had descended to the lowest depth of degradation ; but the Tenth Century, the Dark or Iron Age, as it has been called, of the Papacy, witnessed, if possible, a lower fall. Throughout that period the Papacy was the object of contention between rival factions at Rome. After making a large deduction from the statements of the chief authority, the Italian chronicler Luitbrand, who was the cotemporary of the events which he relates, a residue of crime bears out the description given by Mosheim, that the history of the Popes is " a history of monsters, a record of the most atrocious villanies and crimes, which is acknowledged by all the best writers and even by the advocates of Popery." Baronius does not attempt to screen the scandalous enormities of the Popes (*homines monstruosi, vitâ turpissimi, moribus perditissimi, usquequaque fædissimi*). But he and the Roman controversialists who follow him, contend that the lowest degradation of those who boasted to be the Vicars of Christ, is the strongest proof in favour of their Church which could have weathered such a storm. " Speak gently of a sister's fall ;" but how can any one seriously suppose that men who, instead of being shepherds were savage wolves, bent on ruining souls for which Christ died, can really be His appointed Vicars upon earth ?

The unwholesome history of the Tenth Century cannot altogether be dismissed without notice, but the merest outline will suffice.

For more than fifty years the election of the Papacy was in the hands of three beautiful but abandoned women, Theodora, a member of a wealthy Senatorial family, and her two daughters, Theodora and Marozia ; who through their influence with the profligate Noblemen and Clergy of Rome, contrived to obtain the Pontifical throne for their paramours and illegitimate children.

The Tenth Century opens with the Pontificate of Benedict IV. (900—903). His successor, Leo V., had only been Pope for part of two months when he was driven out and cast into prison by one of his own Chaplains, named Christopher, who then became Pope (903—904); but who within two months was himself ejected by Sergius III. (904—911), a monster of iniquity, to whom, says Baronius, the title of Apostate rather than of Apostle is applicable. He was the paramour of Marozia.

After Anastasius III. (911—913), and Lando (913—914), John X. (914—928), the paramour of one of the Theodoras, was raised from the See of Ravenna to the Papal throne, and distinguished himself rather as a warrior than a Cleric.

The elder Theodora dies or disappears; her equally disreputable daughter, Marozia, who took her place and influence at Rome, gained possession of the Castle of St. Angelo. John the Pope, after he had occupied the See of Rome for fourteen years, during which he had at the head of an army defeated the Saracens, and rescued Rome, if not Christendom, from the unbelievers, being surprised by her in the Lateran Palace, was thrown into prison, where he died, it was supposed by a violent death, a few months afterwards.

Leo VI. (928—929), and then Stephen VII. (929—931), intervening, John XI. (931—936), who was supposed by some to be the son of Pope Sergius by Marozia, became Pope. Other authorities, however, make him her legitimate son by her first husband, Alberic (she found, mentions Dean Milman, two others unscrupulous enough after the death or murder of Alberic (A.D. 925), to condone her infidelities). Her son, also named Alberic, headed a conspiracy in Rome, and having (A.D. 932) gained possession of the Castle of St. Angelo, committed both his mother and the Pope to prison, where the latter died, A.D. 936.

The next four Popes seem to have been made of good character; but iniquity reached a climax under John XII.

(955—963), the son of Alberic and grandson of Marozia, who became Pope at the age of eighteen. His name had been Octavianus, and he is the first instance recorded of a change of name being made on election to the Papacy. Although in Holy Orders, he combined with his sacred office the secular government of Rome, which had been bequeathed to him by his father. We need not detail his character; let any one imagine to himself the worst a man can be, and then he has his moral picture. Women were even afraid to go to the churches, lest they should be surprised in their devotions and be made the victims of the Pope.

The vileness of the Roman See in the Ninth or Tenth Centuries was one of the most revolting profanations of Religion in the whole history of the world; with one exception, however, says Dean Church, of its repetition in a more enlightened time at the end of the Fifteenth and beginning of the Sixteenth Century, by Popes Sixtus IV., Alexander VI., and Leo X.

At the time of its lowest degradation and shame, the Papacy found a reformer and a saviour in Otto the Great, who, in the irony of history, was invited into Italy, not only by the principal citizens, both lay and clerical, but by Pope John himself. At a time when anarchy was prevailing in their country, the Romans demanded the revival of what they considered the suspended but not extinct Roman Empire, and looked for help to Germany, which was free from the troubles which beset Italy under its titular King Berengar II. Otto was accordingly invited to come into Italy, with the offer of the Imperial title. The Germans considered themselves the rightful representatives of the Carolingian Empire, and Otto, who showed no unwillingness to accept the offered dignity, started on his journey, and having been acknowledged as King of Italy at Pavia, arrived in Rome, A.D. 961, at the head of an army, subdued Italy and delivered the Pope and the government from the anarchy which was desolating it. Having bound himself to protect the Holy See he was, on

the Feast of Purification in the following year, crowned Emperor at Rome by the Pope, the citizens swearing for the future to elect no Pope without the Imperial consent. With the Coronation of Otto I. (962—973) a new Era in the Western Empire commenced. Hitherto the Imperial Crown had been worn now by one, now by another, of the Kings between whom the dominions of Charlemagne had been broken up; but from the time of Otto all the Emperors were Germans.

The corruption of the Papacy and of the Church generally, justified, or rather necessitated his intervention. The Romans now requested Otto to hold an investigation into the character of the Pope, and a Synod assembled for that purpose in November, A.D. 963. Amongst the crimes of a kind too gross to be mentioned, the Pope was accused of habitually neglecting the services of the Church; and when he did attend them, of never signing himself with the Cross; of celebrating Mass without himself communicating (an heretical act performed *ex cathedra* and therefore fatal to Papal Infallibility); of holding Ordination in a stable; of selling Episcopal Orders; of drinking wine to the love of the Devil; and of invoking heathen deities, Jove and Venus, to aid him in his gambling. The Pope being called upon to defend himself, replied only with threats of excommunication; "John, the servant of God, to all the Bishops. We hear that it is your intention to choose another Pope; if you do, in the name of Almighty God, I excommunicate you." John was deposed, and Leo, the chief Secretary of the Roman See, elected in his stead.

Scarcely, however, had Otto retired from Rome, than John convened another Synod, deposed Leo, and excommunicated him and his adherents; but the wicked Pope was soon afterwards assassinated whilst carrying on an adulterous intrigue near Rome. Benedict V. was then elected by the Roman party, who had now arisen against the Germans, to succeed him; he was, however, compelled by the Emperor to retire, and sent into exile

to Hamburg, where he died. The Secretary Leo, a man of good character, but not as yet in Holy Orders, was consecrated as his successor under the title of Leo VIII. (963—965). From him the Emperor received the confirmation of the right, which the people had given him in 963, of imposing an absolute Veto on Papal elections.

Leo was succeeded by John XIII. (965—972), who was consecrated with the sanction of the Emperor. Being driven from Rome by the anti-German party, he was soon afterwards restored by Otto.

In 973 Otto I. died, and was succeeded by his son, Otto II. (973—983), who had from 967 been associated in the Empire with his father, and been crowned at Rome by John XIII. Otto II. married Theophano, a daughter of the Eastern Emperor Romanus.

Benedict VI. (972—974), who had succeeded John as Pope, fell a victim to a Cardinal Deacon, Bonifaccio Franconi, and by him was cast into prison, where he was strangled. Bonifaccio, who was then set up as Pope by the Roman party, took the title of Boniface VII. ; but after two months he was expelled from the city, and fled, carrying with him, says Platina, the most precious things from the Church of St. Peter, to Constantinople.

Benedict VII. (974—983), the nephew of Alberic ^b, was the next Pope, and assembled a Council at which Bonifaccio, the murderer of his predecessor, was excommunicated.

The Emperor Otto II. dying, A.D. 983, the same year as the Pope, was succeeded by his son, Otto III. (983—1002), who was only five years of age, the government of the Empire during his minority being carried on by his mother, Theophano. When he was fifteen years of age, his instruction was entrusted to Gerbert, a man of unimpeachable character, who enjoyed the reputation of being the most learned mathematician and astronomer of the time.

^b See p. 387.

To Benedict VII. succeeded John XIV. (983—984), Bishop of Pavia, who also was thrown into prison by Bonifaccio, who had returned to Rome, bringing with him a large fortune amassed at Constantinople from the sale of his sacrilegious plunder. John died in prison, but whether from starvation, or poison, is uncertain. Thereupon Bonifaccio, the believed murderer of two Popes, assumed the Papacy as Boniface VII. (984—985), but died six months afterwards.

John XV. (985—996), a man of noble family, succeeded, and although he was driven for a time by the German party out of Rome, yet under his Pontificate the troubled Church of Rome enjoyed some measure of peace and quietness. On the death of John, the young Emperor appointed Bruno, his own cousin and Chaplain, a young man twenty-four years of age, of unblemished and austere character, to succeed him. Bruno (996—999), who was the first German Pope, took the title of Gregory V., and from him Otto III. received the Imperial Crown on Ascension-Day, A.D. 996.

But before a year had elapsed, the German Pope was forced by the turbulent Romans to fly from Rome, and an Antipope John XVI. (997—998), a Greek subject of the Eastern Emperor, was chosen by the Romans to succeed him. John, who had been Bishop of Placentia, and who was perhaps recommended by the Emperor's mother Theophano, a Byzantine Princess, was chosen by the Romans, as more likely than a German to be subservient to their wishes. The Antipope, however, was soon deposed by Otto, and after being subjected to cruel mutilation, was banished. Gregory only held his restored, but troubled, dignity for a short time, dying suddenly, it was supposed by poison, at the age of twenty-seven.

Gerbert was appointed to succeed him. Born of humble parentage in Auvergne, Gerbert was educated at the Clugniac Monastery of Aurriliac, where he gave early signs of that learning which afterwards distinguished him. Thence he went

to complete his studies to Spain, where he perfected himself in the study of Astronomy and in Mathematics, which at a time when they were neglected by the teachers of Christendom, were confined to the Mahometan schools. He then went as a teacher to the School at Rheims, and was afterwards appointed by Otto II. Abbot of the famous Monastery of Bobbio, which owed its foundation to St. Columban. Here he found everything in the greatest disorder; the buildings dilapidated; the monks insubordinate; not only had he to contend with such difficulties, but also with the additional drawback of his unpopular connection with the Germans. He therefore resumed his work at Rheims, where for ten years he taught with such success that he raised the school to a high standard; imported into it rare and valuable MSS.; introduced Geometry and the Arabian numerals; and taught the construction of clocks and astronomical instruments, by which he drew upon himself the reputation of a magician and a wizard; he even devised an organ worked by steam; the earliest notice perhaps of steam, as applied to such or such like purposes.

In a Synod at Rheims (A.D. 991), he was appointed to the Archbishopric of that See, in the place of the Archbishop Arnulf, whom it deposed. But here again his German connection rendered him unpopular, not only both with the higher and lower Clergy, who were unwilling to submit to his strict discipline, so at variance with the general laxity, but also the laity. The Legates of John XV. reversing the sentence of the Council of Rheims, interdicted Gerbert from the performance of his Episcopal functions; and the future Pope, protesting strongly against the usurped pretensions of the Pope, fled in 993 to the Court of Otto III. Here he became the young Prince's tutor and principal adviser, whilst Arnulf, in another Council at Rheims, was reinstated in the Archbishopric.

In 999 Gerbert was raised by Otto to the See of Rome, and took the title of Sylvester II. (999—1003), as an indication of

the similar relations in which he stood to the Emperor, as those which had existed between the First Sylvester and Constantine the Great.

Otto III. ("the wonder of the world," as he was called) died A.D. 1002 childless, on the threshold of manhood, a victim to Stephania, the widow of the Consul Crescentius. Crescentius, who was the Leader of the Republicans at Rome against the German Emperor, had been put to death in the Castle of St. Angelo in an insurrection, and to avenge his death, his widow contrived the death of Otto by means of a slow poison. The three Ottos (962—1002) had done their best for the Church, by appointing to the various Sees a better type of Bishops from those who had followed the example of the Popes in bringing scandal on the Church, and their interference was often invoked as necessary for the preservation of the Empire and of the Church. Otto III. appointed such Popes as Bruno and Gerbert in the place of the profligate Popes. But their lives were unfortunately short, and Sylvester II. only survived Otto by one year.

The direct line of the Ottos came to an end with Otto III. Henry II. (1002—1024), (a descendant of Henry I.) or St. Henry, for he was canonised, A.D. 1152, by Pope Eugenius III., was crowned King of Germany by the Archbishop of Mainz. Born A.D. 972, he received his early education and spiritual instruction from St. Wolfgang, Bishop of Ratisbon, by whose death (A.D. 994) he was so deeply affected that he determined to embrace the Priesthood. But it was decreed otherwise, and his education did not unfit him for the duties of a statesman, and from becoming a worthy successor of the Ottos.

The three Popes who succeeded Sylvester, John XVI. (June—December, 1003); John XVII. (1003—1009); and Sergius IV. (1009—1012), although their tenure of the Papacy was uneventful, were men of a different stamp of character from the Popes of the Tenth Century. On the death of Sergius, the same Roman party who had done so much evil to the Church by

their appointment of those profligate Popes, now appointed a Pope named Gregory, who, however, was soon deposed by Henry, and Benedict VIII. (1012—1024), by whom Henry was crowned Emperor, became Pope.

Both Henry II. and Benedict VIII. died A.D. 1024. In 1025 Cunegunda, the wife of Henry, adopted the life of a *Religious*; she also was, like her husband, afterwards canonised (A.D. 1200) by Pope Innocent III. With Henry, the Line of Saxonian Emperors came to an end. Henry was succeeded by Conrad II. (Emperor 1027—1039), who was descended from a daughter of Otto the Great, and with him the Line of Franconian Emperors, so called from their coming from the Teutonic Franconia, commenced. A brother of Benedict VIII. being elected by the Roman party to succeed him as Pope, took the title of John XVIII. (1024—1033), and by him Conrad was crowned Emperor, A.D. 1027, the Coronation being attended by Canute, King of England, who was on one of the pilgrimages, which were at that time much in vogue, to Rome.

On the death of Pope John, one of those appointments which so often disgraced the Papacy, was made by the Roman party, Benedict IX. (1033—1046), a boy of nine or ten years of age, and nephew of the two preceding Popes, being appointed. That the election was due to bribery, we learn on the authority of Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Casino, who himself became Pope, A.D. 1086, as Victor III. "The son of Alberic," he says, "following the footsteps of Simon Magus, rather than of Simon Peter, obtained the Pontificate by wholesale bribery; (non parvâ a Patre in populum profligatâ pecuniâ) and his life after his election was too horrible to mention; (horresco referens)." Benedict, who rivalled the vices of the worst of his predecessors, was upheld in his debaucheries by two of his brothers who held high civil offices in Rome. He was expelled for a time from Rome, Sylvester III. (1044—1046) being appointed in his place, but through the influence of his relations he was enabled to return.

In 1045 he consummated his iniquities by selling the Papacy to a Presbyter, named Gratian, who became Pope under the title of Gregory VI. (1045—1046). The new Pope, whose Chaplain was, the soon to become famous, Hildebrand, was reputed a man of Learning, and had hitherto enjoyed an unblemished character; to do evil that good may come is a very questionable proceeding; but the purchase of the Papacy was excused both by himself and others on the ground of expediency; and hopes were reposed in him, that he would prove a reformer of the prevalent evils.

Benedict the salesman, however, repenting of his bargain, soon resumed the office which he had sold. So that there were now three Popes ("three devils," Canon Robertson, quoting from a writer of that century, says they were called); Sylvester III., Gregory VI., and Benedict IX., each supported by the carnal weapons of a rival faction, and each holding possession of one of the principal churches of Rome, Sylvester St. Peter's, Benedict St. John Lateran, and Gregory St. Maria Maggiore. From one or the other of these churches each of them anathematised their rivals and their rivals' adherents.

Such a scandal to Christendom was intolerable. Conrad the Emperor having died, A.D. 1039, was succeeded by his son Henry III. (Emperor 1046—1056), who, like Otto I. before him, was implored by the Clergy and devout people of Rome to exercise his authority. Henry, who was one of the greatest of the Emperors, bestowed the Papacy on several German Bishops in succession, who made far better Popes than the Romans who had preceded them. No German sovereign had ever exercised so absolute sway as the new Emperor, and under him the German Empire reached the meridian of its power. At a Council of Bishops which the Emperor summoned to Sutri, Sylvester was condemned as an intruder and deposed. Benedict voluntarily abdicated his claims, and retired to a monastery. Gregory, who had presided at the Council, could not deny the accusation of

simony ; so stripping off his Pontifical robes, he either voluntarily resigned the Papacy or was deposed. Soon afterwards, accompanied by Hildebrand, he withdrew to a Monastery in Germany, having exacted a promise from the Romans that for the future they would only elect a Pope with the Emperor's consent.

The Papacy was now vacant, and Henry, who was bent on a reformation of the Church, finding it honeycombed with ignorance, and simony, and secular habits of the Roman Clergy, (some deduction must be made from the charge of immorality, at a time when concubinage and Clerical marriage often meant one and the same thing), appointed a German, the Bishop of Bamberg, who took the title of Clement II. (1046—1047), and by him the Emperor and his wife Agnes were crowned on Christmas-day, A.D. 1046. Clement died after a Pontificate of ten months. Suidgar, Bishop of Brixen, was then elected and took the title of Damasus II., but died in the following year.

The Emperor next appointed his own cousin Bruno, who since A.D. 1026 had been Bishop of Toul, where he had applied himself to a reformation of the Clergy and the Monasteries ; a man of high reputation for learning and for the holiness of his life, as well as being an eloquent preacher. The necessity of a reformation of the Papacy was universally admitted. But Hildebrand was now coming to the front, and under his guidance a general feeling prevailed that the reformation ought not to proceed even from a pious Emperor, as Henry was acknowledged to be, but from the Church itself. The Pope designate, who was above all things a Churchman, objected, and in his objection he was seconded by Hildebrand, to receive the appointment from a layman.

Alighting from his horse some miles from the city, and laying aside his Mitre and Episcopal robes, barefooted like a Pilgrim, he entered Rome, where he was well known for his piety and for the yearly pilgrimage, which he had been in the habit of

making to the tombs of the Apostles. He was at once elected Pope by the suffrages of the Clergy and people, and ascended the Papal throne under the title of Leo IX. (1048—1054).

Leo was the very Pope whom the circumstances of the time required, and under him the authority and dignity of the Papacy was re-established. Hildebrand, being ordained by him, was appointed to the Abbacy of St. Paul's in Rome. Leo proceeded to attack one of the prevalent vices, that of simony, and held synods for the purpose of eradicating it. But so deep-rooted was the evil, that he found that nearly all the Clergy were infected with it, and that, had he insisted, as he at first intended, on their deprivation, nearly all the Clergy would be deprived; whilst if he annulled the Orders of the simoniacal Bishops, the whole Spiritual succession for years past would be thrown into disorder. He was obliged, therefore, to adopt gentler measures, to which also the natural kindness of his disposition readily inclined him.

The same difficulty met him in what was termed concubinage, which, as before stated, generally meant the marriage of the Clergy. Married Clergy everywhere existed, and although such marriages were condemned in a Synod at Rome, the Bishops were unwilling to enforce the decree.

Leo carried his Supremacy even beyond the limits prescribed by the Forged Decretals. Thrice he crossed the Alps, and held Councils, with the view of asserting his authority over the whole Western Church. In one of his visits (A.D. 1049) he held a Council at Rheims, where he consecrated the new Cathedral of St. Remigius, the Patron Saint of France, and the baptizer of Clovis. He held in the same year another Council at Maintz, which confirmed the acts of Rheims in condemnation of simony and the marriage of the Clergy.

In 1050, in a Council at Rome, he condemned the Heresy on the Holy Eucharist of Berengar, Archdeacon of Angers. In the same year, in a Council of Vercelli, he confirmed the

censure passed at Rome against Berengar, and also condemned a book written by John Scotus Erigena.

In the Pontificate of Leo, the ill-feeling which had so long existed between East and West was brought to a head. There had been occasional schisms between them, but until the middle of the Eleventh Century, they had acknowledged each other as parts of the Catholic Church.

In 1053, Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople, (1043—1059), a man of restless and uncharitable temper, addressed a letter full of invective against the Western Church, to the Bishop of Trani, in Apulia, which was then subject to the Eastern Church; and this letter he desired to be communicated to Pope Leo and the Western Bishops. The principal points complained of were;—the Use of Unleavened Bread in the Holy Eucharist, whence he called the Westerns Azymites, (ἄζυμος, unleavened); Fasting on Saturdays in Lent; and eating things strangled and of blood, in violation of the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 20). At the same time he closed the Roman Churches and Monasteries in Constantinople.

These charges naturally excited much indignation at Rome, and the Pope (A.D. 1054) sent three Legates, the principal of whom was the imperious and uncharitable Cardinal Bishop Humbert, with counter-charges, to Constantinople. The Pope complained of the assumption by the Patriarch of the title of *Œcumenical*, and of his wishing to subject to himself the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch; of the Greeks rebaptizing the Latins; of their permitting Clerical marriages; and their not admitting the Procession of the Son from the Holy Ghost.

The Emperor, who was desirous of conciliating the Pope against his enemies the Normans, who were now beginning to make conquests in the Eastern Empire, lodged the Legates in the Imperial Palace, where Cerularius refrained from visiting them. Humbert accordingly visited the Patriarch, before whom he assumed great arrogance, managing to put himself as much

in the wrong, as Cerularius had been before. Cerularius in a letter to the Patriarch of Antioch complained that Humbert, refusing even to discuss the points at issue, insisted on an unconditional surrender and compliance of the Greeks. The Legates publicly excommunicated all those who disobeyed the Holy, Apostolical, Roman See, to which "the special care of all the Churches belongs;" and finally, on July 16, A.D. 1054, they left a writ of excommunication on the Altar of the Church of St. Sophia. Cerularius held a Council in which he retorted the Anathema on the Western Church, and the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem made common cause with him. For some time after the death of Cerularius, some degree of Ecclesiastical Communion was kept up; but thus the lamentable schism which has never since been healed was brought about, and thus the Church of Rome shut itself off from the Churches of the East which produced most of the greatest Saints whom the Christian Church reveres, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Athanasius, Basil the Great, the two Gregories, of Nazianzum and Nyssa, and numberless other Saints and Martyrs.

Jerusalem was undoubtedly the Mother Church of Christianity, and the principal Churches of the East can boast an Apostolical foundation. The Eastern and Roman Churches held essentially the same doctrines (for the difference as to the *Filioque* clause is one of discipline, in which they might agree to differ, rather than of doctrine;) whilst the difference as to the Marriage of the Clergy is likewise one of discipline. The Eastern Church holds that there are five Patriarchs, to which was for a time added that of Moscow for the Russian Church (which however since the time of Peter the Great has been governed by the *Holy Synod*). It is willing to concede a Primacy of honour to the Patriarch of Rome, notwithstanding that the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Rome were put on an equality by the General Councils. The Roman Church acknowledges the Greek to be orthodox, though schis-

matical, and whilst the former Church claims for itself the title of exclusive Catholicity, the latter claims that of exclusive orthodoxy. The Eastern Church cannot recognise the modern doctrine of Papal Infallibility as decreed by the Vatican Council, A.D. 1870. Although it holds the Virgin Mary in equal veneration, it does not recognise the dogma of Immaculate Conception, as defined by the Pope, A.D. 1854. Whilst the Roman Church withdraws the Cup from the Laity, the Eastern Church administers the Consecrated Bread dipped in Wine. The points of difference as compared with those of agreement are insignificant; yet they are as far from agreement now, as they were eight hundred years ago. "When the two Churches meet in closest proximity," says Schaff, "over the traditional spots of the Birth and Tomb of our Saviour, at Bethlehem and Jerusalem, their bigoted and ignorant monks have to be kept from violent collision by Mahomedan soldiers."

In the last year of his life, Pope Leo IX. assuming a rôle completely at variance with his former sanctity of character, took the field in person against the Normans, who having expelled the Saracens out of Naples, and though professedly Christians, had become dangerous neighbours to Rome. Leo had applied to Henry III. for assistance, which the Emperor was dissuaded by his Chancellor, Gebhard, Bishop of Eichstadt, who eventually succeeded Leo as Pope, from sending. Leo then himself took the field, and being defeated in battle was sent a prisoner to Benevento, where he was detained for nearly a year, being treated with every respect and honour by his captors. Here he spent his time in repentance, in fasting and prayer, wearing a hair-cloth vest next his body, and lying at night on the floor with a stone for his pillow. Being seized with illness, he was allowed to return to Rome. Ordering his bed to be prepared in St. Peter's, he there calmly awaited his end, exhorting the Clergy to the last to beware of simony; and on April 19, A.D. 1054, he passed away before the Altar of St. Peter.

CHAPTER XII.

THE BATTLE OF INVESTITURE.

RAVAGES of the Northmen—Britain made one under Egbert, King of Wessex—Ravages of the Danes in Britain—Especially fatal to the Monasteries—The murder of St. Edmund—King Alfred—Baptism of the Danish Leader Guthrum—The Danelagh—Decay of Learning in Britain—Ravages of the Danes in Gaul—Kollo or Rolf, the Norman Chief—The Normans gain possession of Normandy—And receive Christianity—The Danes and English amalgamated in one English Nation—Revival of Monasteries in England—St. Dunstan—Council of Winchester—Of Calne—St. Edward the Martyr—Victory of the Regulars—Martyrdom of St. Elphege, Archbishop of Canterbury—Sweyne, King of England—Canute—Edward the Confessor—He appoints Normans to English Sees—Harold—Battle of Hastings—William the Conqueror—Henry IV., Emperor of Germany—New Rule made for the Election of Popes—Pope Alexander II.—Honorius II., Antipope—Hildebrand, Pope, as Gregory VII.—The neglected education of the young Henry IV.—Hildebrand applies himself to the work of Reform—Attacks Investiture—Contest with Henry IV.—Canossa—Civil War in Germany—Guibert, Antipope, as Clement III.—Crowns Henry IV. as Emperor—Sack of Rome by Robert Guiscard—Death of Pope Gregory VII.—Great advances of Papal claims—Not acknowledged in England—Origin of Peter Pence—Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury—Renewal of the Eucharistic Controversy—Berengar—The Doctrine of the Church of England—Urban II., Pope—Council of Clermont—Death of the Emperor Henry IV.—Pope Paschal II. and the Emperor Henry V.—Continuation of the Investiture Contest—Imported into England—Archbishop Anselm—Flies from King William II. to Rome—Pope Urban greets him as the *Pope of another World*—Council of Bari—Anselm returns to England—His contest with Henry I. as to Investiture—Goes again to Rome—Settlement of the long Investiture Battle in England—Anselm the opponent of Clerical Marriages—The Investiture Battle arranged in the Council of Worms—Contest between Henry II. and Becket—The Constitutions of Clarendon—Becket and Pope Alexander III.—Martyrdom of Becket—Penance of Henry II.

MEANWHILE what was the condition of the Church in Britain during the period which we traversed in the last chapter? The Eighth Century was a golden era of Anglo-Saxon Christianity. We have seen how that in the first half of the century its mis-

sionaries carried the Gospel to the Frisians, Hessians, Thuringians, and Bavarians; how at the end of the century its schools were considered the best in Christendom, so that to them Charlemagne, when he wished to revive the almost extinguished literature in his own country, turned for help.

But in the Ninth Century a long period of political, as well as religious and intellectual, darkness set in, so that, instead of foreigners coming to England to seek for learning, Englishmen were obliged to seek it on the Continent. At the end of the Eighth Century the last migration of Germans Westwards, this time from Denmark and Norway, took place; and a new horde of invaders, under the common name of Northmen, with results not less eventful than the former invasions of Goths and Franks, and Anglo-Saxons, began a series of ravages, and finally settled down as conquerors in France and England.

The overlordship of the Kingdoms of the Saxon Heptarchy passed at the commencement of the Ninth Century to Wessex, in the person of its King, Egbert (802—832), under whom Britain became one Nation; the history of the Heptarchy ends, and the history of England, although not yet in name, begins.

Scarcely, however, had Britain become one, than a terrible calamity ensued, which threatened to tear asunder the newly-compacted kingdom. The Danes had begun their ravages in Britain as early as A.D. 787, in which year they landed in Wessex; and again in 793 they made a descent in Northumbria. Being Pagans themselves, they hated Christianity for a double reason; because Charlemagne had forced it on them as a badge of slavery, and because they regarded the English as apostates from the faith of Woden. So their wrath was particularly turned against the Monasteries; in 793 they burnt the Monastery and slew the Monks of Lindisfarne, and in the following year a similar calamity at their hands befel the Monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow. Towards the end of Egbert's reign their

attacks became more formidable ; he, however, managed to keep them tolerably under control ; but from A.D. 836—1016 their invasions were almost incessant, and the history of England is made up of the ravages which they committed. At length they succeeded in conquering England, and from 1016—1035 Canute, a Dane, was King of England.

Again we have a repetition of the wanton cruelties committed by the English ; Christian Monks and Priests slain at the altar ; whole cities levelled to the ground ; the same promiscuous slaughter of men ; women and children driven into exile. The history of the Church is chiefly made up of their ravages on the monasteries, to which people had entrusted their wealth for protection, and which from their undefended position were an easy as well as lucrative object of attack. Lindisfarne, Wearmouth, and Jarrow were, as we have seen, the first to perish. The destruction of Bardney, Croyland, Medeshamstede, Ely, Repton, Coldingham, Whitby, and every monastery in Northumbria followed.

Egbert was succeeded by his son Ethelwulf (838—858), a pious King, who was much guided by St. Swithin, Bishop of Winchester (852—862), and who made a grant of the tenth of *his own* lands (as he himself said, the portion of *my* lands which I have in heritage), to the Church. Nearly the whole of his reign, as well as the reigns of his three eldest sons (858—871) who succeeded him, were taken up with the Danish wars. In 870 St. Edmund, Under-King of East Anglia, was defeated and slain in battle ; the Danes first tried to induce him to renounce Christianity, and on his refusal, after having bound him in chains, and cruelly beaten him, they tied his naked body to a tree, and having shot him to death with arrows, afterwards beheaded him. From him Bury St. Edmund's takes its name.

When Alfred, the fourth and youngest son of Ethelwulf, came to the throne, the country was overwhelmed in apparently hope-

less ruin, and it appeared that Christianity would perish altogether out of the land.

Alfred (871—901), who was born at Wantage, A.D. 849, succeeded to the throne of Wessex in 871. In 875 Lindisfarne was for a second time ravaged by the Danes. Alfred, who had retired to Athelney, a little island in Somersetshire, never lost heart, and having collected a large army, defeated them in a great battle near Ethendun. Their leader, Guthrum, and his followers were induced to receive Baptism, Alfred standing as Godfather to Guthrum. But Alfred, feeling that he was not strong enough to drive them out of England, concluded with Guthrum the treaty of Wedmore, by which England was divided into two parts, one part being conceded to the Danes, and called Danelagh, the Land of the Danish Law. The Danes had become English Churchmen; and it could only be a matter of time before English and Danes, being one in religion, would be amalgamated also into one Nation.

Since in the monasteries, the books and all the literature of the land were deposited, the extinction of learning amongst Clergy as well as laity followed their destruction. "When I began to reign," said Alfred, "I cannot remember one Priest South of the Thames who could explain his Service-book in English." To promote the cause of education, he sought for teachers not only from his own Kingdom but also from the Continent. He did his best, but with only partial success, to revive the Monastic system, and founded three Monasteries, one for women, to which he appointed his own daughter as Abbess, and two for men. But his foundation of the University of Oxford is now allowed to be a fabrication.

More important still was his own work as an author. To him, probably, England is mainly indebted for the inestimable treasure of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. He translated Orosius' *History*, at that time the popular manual; Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*; Pope Gregory the Great's *Pastoral Care*; and

Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*. He also translated portions of the Bible.

The ravages of the Danes on the Continent had not been less disastrous than they were in Britain. In Gaul they had begun their depredations even under Charlemagne, who, however, was able to keep them at bay; but under his degenerate descendants, their attacks became as frequent and as fatal as in Britain. In 841 they sailed up the Seine, and pillaged and burnt Rouen. In 845, and again in 857, they appeared before the walls of Paris, rifled the Abbeys of SS. Geneviève and Germain des Prés, and extorted the Danegeld. In 881 they pillaged and burnt Cologne, Coblenz, Liège, Antwerp, and Aachen and Rheims. Thence they returned, and began to make settlements in Gaul, occupying Bayeux, Evreux, and Chartres. We now hear of their famous Chief Rollo, or Rolf, who by a treaty with Charles the Bald, A.D. 876, was enabled to occupy Rouen. In 911 he received from Charles the Simple, King of the West Franks, the land at the mouth of the Seine, which after his followers took the name of Normandy; and shortly afterwards, he, like Guthrum in England, received Baptism at the hands of the Archbishop of Rouen, Robert, Duke of Paris, whose name he took in exchange for his own, standing as his Godfather. Most of his followers, after his example, became Christians; and the Normans formed part of the Frank kingdom, learning to speak the language, and adopting the customs of the Franks. Robert, as Duke of Normandy, took rank with the Dukes of Paris and of Flanders, and his descendants became the most powerful Princes in Gaul. Churches were built and justice equally administered; and Normandy arose to a high state of prosperity in commerce and civilisation; and we shall soon hear of the Normans as conquerors of England.

The work of fusing English and Danes into one Nation was continued, with hard fighting and frequent reverses, under Alfred's successors; till in the reign of Edgar (959—975), sur-

named the *Peaceful*, the Anglo-Danes confessed themselves beaten, and Danes and English became amalgamated in one Kingdom.

Such Monasticism as survived the Danish conquests in England was in a very degenerate state. The Monasteries were rarely tenanted by Regular, or even unmarried, Clergy. Secular Clergy, with their wives and children, occupied them, where they lived lazy lives, refusing to perform the services of the Church. The Monasteries, which in many cases became hereditary, were the hotbeds of vice and iniquity; the Monks either adopted Secular professions, or the better sort fled to the Monasteries of Fleury and Ghent on the Continent.

The great Reviver of the English Monasteries was St. Dunstan, who became Archbishop of Canterbury (959—988). Dunstan was not only a Scholar and Church-Reformer, but also the leading English Statesman of the day. Edgar reigned, but Dunstan ruled the country. Odo his predecessor in the Primacy was a Dane, as also was Oskytal, who (A.D. 958) was translated from the See of Dorchester to the Archbishopric of York. It was through Dunstan's wise appointment of Danes to high places, that the amalgamation of English and Danes into one people was effected in Edgar's reign; in the same reign, the name of Britain passed into that of England, or Engla-land, the land of the English. But Dunstan, who had been a Monk and Abbot of Glastonbury, and was like Odo, a bitter enemy of Clerical marriages, at once turned out the Seculars and introduced Regular Monks, under the Benedictine Rule, into the Monasteries. The cause was decided in favour of the Regular Monks in a Council at Winchester, A.D. 969, and in another at Calne, A.D. 978, after Edgar's death. The boy-King Edward (975—979) was also a favourer of Dunstan and the Regulars; and his cruel murder (whence he is called St. Edward the Martyr) by his stepmother, added to the decision at Calne, completely

threw the victory into the hands of the Regulars, who having got it, held it to the Reformation.

Under Ethelred (979—1006), called the *Unready*, (from his unwillingness to listen to *rede* or counsel), the *Danegeld* (an annual tribute to the Danes) was for the first time imposed in England. In 1002 Ethelred married Emma, daughter of Richard, Duke of Normandy, and thus an intimate connection, leading to the most important results, sprung up between England and Normandy. But a cruel and dastardly act perpetrated by Ethelred with the consent of his Witenagemot on St. Bryce's Day (November 13), gave Sweyne, King of Denmark, an excuse for invading England. On that day, although the Danes and English were at the time at peace, a general slaughter of the Danes in England, without respect to station, or age, or sex, took place; Sweyne's own sister, the Christian Gunilda, after her husband and children were murdered before her eyes, being subjected, by order of the King himself, to the same fate.

The vengeance that Sweyne exacted was terrible. Canterbury was taken, the Cathedral burnt, and (A.D. 1012) the saintly Archbishop Elphege put to death. He was afterwards venerated as St. Elphege or Alphege, the Martyr. Ethelred, driven out from England, took refuge in Normandy, whereupon Sweyne himself became King of England; after Ethelred's death, and that of his son, Edmund Ironsides, Canute, Sweyne's son, was, by the voice of Englishmen and Danes, called to succeed to the throne (1016—1035). Canute, who had been already baptized, married (A.D. 1017) Emma the widow of Ethelred; and he who had been before a savage barbarian was converted into the model of a wise and zealous Christian King. Under the advice of Ethelnoth, Archbishop of Canterbury, all distinctions between English and Danes were abolished, and now more than before they were fused into one Nation.

But the love which the English bore to Canute turned into hatred against the violence and oppression of his sons, who were

in consequence supplanted by Edward, surnamed the Confessor, (1042—1066). Edward, a man better suited for a Cloister than the Throne, having spent seven years of his life in Normandy, had lost all sympathy with the English people, and was thoroughly Norman in his tastes and habits. He appointed Normans to high places in Church and state; made Robert, Abbot of Jumiéges in Normandy, first (A.D. 1044), Bishop of London, and then (A.D. 1050) Archbishop of Canterbury; Ulf, another Norman, he appointed Bishop of Dorchester; Spearhafoc, Abbot of Abingdon, who was with the approval of the King and Witenagemot nominated to London, the Archbishop refused to consecrate, on the ground that the Pope had forbidden it, and William another Norman was consecrated in his place.

The English were so disgusted with thus having foreigners placed over them, that the Norman Prelates, Robert and Ulf, were driven out of the Kingdom. Robert applied to the Pope for help; the Pope, who was better disposed to the Roman Normans than he was to the independent English, decided in his favour; but Stigand, Bishop of Winchester, was appointed to the Primacy.

There was certainly much against Stigand; he was a Pluralist, and was appointed to a See not canonically vacant. The Pope also naturally looked upon him as a usurper, because his election had not been confirmed by him.

The King, in pursuance of a vow, built Westminster Abbey, which was consecrated on December 28, A.D. 1065, he himself dying on January 6, of the following year. By placing foreigners over English Sees he had done his best to denationalise England and to Romanise the Church; he failed, because the feeling of the English Church was too strong against him. But by introducing Normans into England, and especially William, Duke of Normandy, to whom he is said to have offered the succession to the throne, he laid the foundation of the Norman Conquest;

whilst by his zeal for the Pope, he paved the way for Rome's ascendancy.

On his death, Harold, his wife's brother, became King of England, and was crowned by Stigand, which subjected Harold to the ill-will of the Pope. The great battle of Senlac or Hastings, to which the Norman William went with the blessing and a consecrated Banner from the Pope, who thereby invested it with the character of a Holy War, was fought on October 14, A.D. 1066; with the defeat and death of Harold, the Anglo-Saxon dynasty fell, and William, the first Norman King of England, was crowned on Christmas-day.

On the death of Pope Leo IX., another German, Gebhard, Bishop of Eichstadt, through the all-powerful influence of Hildebrand, who might, had he been so inclined, have himself succeeded, was with the consent of the Emperor consecrated Pope (1054—1057). The Papacy had now arisen from its degradation; Henry had deposed three rival Popes, and himself elected a worthy successor; but conflicting storms were gathering, which required the wisest head and strongest arm; and at that very time the great Emperor died, to be succeeded by his son Henry IV., a boy only five years of age, and under him the death-struggle between the Papacy and Empire broke out.

It must be borne in mind that the German Emperors only possessed the title of Kings till they received the Imperial Coronation; and as Henry IV. was not crowned till A.D. 1084, he must be styled till that year King, and not Emperor.

The new Pope to whom the Emperor had committed the care of his son, carrying on the policy of his predecessor, put forth the highest claims for the Papacy. His Pontificate was however short, and the education of the young Henry was left to his mother, the Dowager Empress.

The next Pope was Frederick, brother of the Duke Godfrey of Lorraine, Cardinal of St. Chrysogonus, and Archdeacon of Rome, who had been a monk and afterwards Abbot of Monte

Casino, and now took the title of Stephen IX. (1057—1058). On his death the Roman Nobles, seizing the opportunity of the King's Minority, set up an Antipope under the title of Benedict X. (1058—1059), whom the Roman Clergy refused to recognise, and Damiani, to whom as Bishop of Ostia the duty fell, refused to consecrate.

The Empress then, on the request of Hildebrand, nominated Gerard Bishop of Florence, who being duly elected by the Cardinals, succeeded as Nicolas II. (1059—1061); the Antipope was excommunicated, and having submitted himself to the rightful Pope, was deprived of his Orders and committed to a monastery.

In a Council held (A.D. 1059) in the Basilica of the Lateran at Rome, at which a hundred and thirty-nine Bishops met, the case of clerical marriage was brought forward, the Archbishop of Milan, who showed an extreme deference to the Pope, being allowed a seat on his right hand. Amongst the Milanese Clergy, who were allowed to be the best in Italy, a single marriage was the general, almost the universal rule. But two Legates, Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, and Peter Damiani, who had been sent by Nicolas to Milan, so effectually stirred up the multitude against the married Clergy, that the Archbishop and a large body of the Clergy agreed in condemnation of the practice, and submitted themselves to the Church of Rome. In the Lateran Council, Clerical, or concubinary, marriages were condemned; and it was at the same time enacted that no Cleric should accept preferment from, or be judged by a Layman.

At this Council also an important change was made in the mode of electing the Popes. As Henry IV. was a minor, scanty deference was paid to the Imperial rights, although he was spoken of as "our beloved son" Henry, who was at present only King, but it was hoped hereafter would become Emperor. Hitherto the Popes had been elected by the general voice of the Cardinals and Clergy, as well as of the Nobles, Burgesses, and

people of Rome, always subject to the sanction of the Emperor. The name of Cardinal, which had been originally restricted to the Clergy of the principal Churches in Italy, had gradually assumed a distinct dignity. The future election of the Pope was vested in the College of the Cardinals, who constituted two classes, Cardinal Bishops and Cardinal Clerks; the former class comprising the seven Bishops of the Pope's immediate Province, Ostia (the first in rank), Porto, Albano, St. Rufino, Frascati, Palestrina, and Sabina. The Cardinal Clerks were subdivided into Cardinal Priests and Cardinal Deacons. The Popes were to be chosen from the Roman Clergy, except in the event that no suitable candidate could be found amongst them. The principal voice in the election was given to the Cardinal Bishops; the next to the Cardinal Clerks; after whom came the other Clergy and laity of Rome; an undefined authority being left, by the favour of the Pope, to the Emperor. In a Canon of a subsequent Lateran Council, A.D. 1179, the votes of two-thirds of the Cardinals were required for a valid election.

On the death of Nicolas, Hildebrand being still unwilling at present to accept the dignity, the Cardinals, at his instigation, elected Anselm of Lucca, without, however, consulting the wishes of Henry or of the Empress Regent; and Anselm assumed the title of Alexander II. (1061—1073). It was from this Pope that William the Conqueror received the consecrated Banner before the battle of Hastings.

Against this Election of the Pope, which was a usurpation of the rights of the young King, a Diet, by the advice of Guibert, who was at that time Chancellor of the Empire, and afterwards became Archbishop of Ravenna, assembled at Basle, where the Empress-mother was then residing; the election of Alexander was annulled, and a rival candidate, Cadolus, Bishop of Parma, elected, who became Pope under the title of Honorius II. (1061—1069). Honorius favoured the Marriage of the Clergy; Anselm and Hildebrand, the latter of whom had spent twenty

years in a monastery at Rome, and afterwards in a stricter ascetic monastery at Clugny, were its opponents. A Clerical war at Rome, between the advocates and opponents of Clerical marriage, was the consequence. Honorius, who had the support of the Lombard and German cities, which favoured the marriages, gained, and for two years held possession of, the Castle of St. Angelo and the Leonine City, and was enthroned in St. Peter's, the other parts of Rome being in the hands of Alexander, who had the support of the Normans. Honorius was, however, little better than a prisoner in the hands of Cencius, Governour of the Castle, whom, after some time he bribed, and was allowed to escape to his Bishopric of Parma. Alexander thus remained in possession of the Papacy till his death in April, A.D. 1073.

On the death of Alexander, Hildebrand, who was then Archdeacon of Rome, but had been virtually Pope under his five predecessors, was elected actual Pope, by the unanimous voice (although it was said not without bribery) of the various orders of the Clergy, and of the people of Rome. He assumed the name of his former patron, Pope Gregory VI., as if by way of intimating his intention of continuing his policy; and reigned as Gregory VII. (1073—1085).

Hildebrand, a native of Tuscany, of humble birth, the son, it was said, of a carpenter, is described as a man of small stature and mean appearance, but with an eagle eye, and of stern and restless disposition. Having been Abbot of a Monastery at Rome, he was appointed as his Chaplain by Pope Gregory VI., by whom he was ordained sub-deacon, and whom he accompanied in his retirement to Germany. Thence, on the death of his patron, he went to Clugny, from which he accompanied Bruno, Bishop of Toul, who became Pope Leo IX., to Rome. Having, as before stated, virtually governed the Papacy during five Pontificates, he was now himself elected Pope.

The young King Henry at first thought of annulling the elec-

tion ; he was, however, assured by the loyal profession of Hildebrand, who announced that he would only accept the proffered dignity with the sanction of the King ; his election was then confirmed, Henry little thinking what a violent opponent to himself and the Empire he was thus raising up.

The character of Henry afforded the Pope a favourable opportunity of depressing the Imperial and aggrandising the Papal power. The education of the young King had not been of a kind to predispose him favourably to the Clergy, and the growing pretensions of the Popes. His earliest years had been spent under the careful supervision of his pious, if not overwise, Empress-mother, who afterwards retired into a convent. Groundless aspersions of her character were, however, spread, and when he was twelve years old a plot was formed for the abduction of the King, which was entrusted to three treacherous accomplices, chief amongst whom was Hanno, Archbishop of Cologne. Whilst the unsuspecting King was engaged in the festivities of a banquet on an island of the Rhine, he was inveighed by Hanno on to his barge, which, as soon as he entered it, cast its moorings and proceeded up the river. Henry, who, suspecting treachery, had thrown himself overboard, was with difficulty rescued from a watery grave by one of the conspirators. There is no reason for doubting but that his talents, if directed into a healthy channel, would have rendered the son of such parents a good and religious ruler ; but the education which he received under Hanno, instead of being adapted to his future station, was of a character to smother all that was good, and to encourage the worst passions of his nature.

Adalbert, Archbishop of Bremen, a vain and unscrupulous man, who became his guardian when he was fifteen years of age, was even a worse guide than Hanno ; for whereas the latter was thoroughly hated, the former, by his fascinating manners, gained a complete ascendancy over him. The avarice, however, of Adalbert, and the undesirable ascendancy which he

had gained over the young King, rendered the guardian so generally unpopular, that Henry was offered the alternative of either abandoning him, or of forfeiting the Crown. Adalbert fell, and ultimately died in poverty. But the example of two such Prelates could not have left a favourable impression of the Church on the mind of the boy-King.

When Hildebrand became Pope, there was great need for reform, but what most of all needed reform was the Papacy itself. He set himself against two things in particular, Clerical marriages and Simony. The former was a practice sanctioned and adopted by the Apostles themselves. The latter involved the bestowal of Ecclesiastical Patronage by laymen, a practice allowed in Germany and England, and other parts of Europe. It had its drawbacks under bad Princes, who often sold Bishoprics for money. But it had equal drawbacks under bad Popes, who were notoriously Simoniacs, in the sense that Gregory applied the term to the Laity.

But there was another question, which more nearly affected the King himself, that of Investiture. The system of Investiture was a complicated one. The Church, by receiving endowments, so far subjected itself to the same law which governed the laity, and the custom, which was one of ancient date, was not unreasonable, that its Rulers should perform Homage (i. e., become the man, *homme*), and receive the secular emblems of Investiture from the secular Power. As more than half the lands of Germany were at the time in the hands of the Church, the condemnation of the system of feudal Investiture would be fatal to legitimate secular authority, and the greater part of Germany would pass from the control of the Emperors to that of the Popes.

At the same time the Investiture of Bishops by the Ring and Crozier, which were the emblems of the spiritual authority, was of recent date, the conferring of which by the Emperor practically involved the appointment by him of the Bishops.

In a Synod held at Rome A.D. 1074, Canons were passed against Simony, under which were included lay patronage and Clerical marriages. In many parts of Italy, the married Clergy formed, if not a majority, yet a large and influential minority.

The married Clergy (Nicolaitans, as they were called, those heretics being supposed to condone such marriages), were forbidden to perform the services of the Church, and the Laity forbidden to accept their ministrations. The Canons against marriage met with strong opposition and defiance, especially in England, Germany, and France, from the Clergy and many Bishops, as opposed to the practice of the Apostles and of the early Church, those who tried to enforce them being maltreated and in danger of their lives. The Pope sent out his Legates with full power to put down all opposition, and an apparent conformity was effected. The Monks, the allies of the Pope, who were in favour of the canons, stirred up an ill-feeling against the married Clergy; and Clerical celibacy has been the law of the Roman Church ever since.

The Pope next proceeded to attack the mode of conferring Investiture; and in the customary Lenten Synod at Rome, at the commencement of 1075, issued a decree against laymen conferring, or any Bishop or Abbot or any other Cleric accepting, Investiture from lay hands. Philip the French King was threatened with excommunication if he disobeyed the Synod; but the contest with him was laid aside for one of greater importance, with the German King.

The unbridled passions of the young King rendered him, from his first assumption of the government, unpopular with his subjects, on whom the Pope, feeling that he could count as allies, determined to subject to the Papacy, the highest secular Power in the world. He wrote a menacing letter to Henry, threatening him with excommunication, and summoning him, in case of disobedience, to Rome at the Lenten Synod on February 22 of the following year. Henry set the Pope's

threats at defiance; and in a Council of German Prelates held at Worms on January 24, A.D. 1076, retaliated by bringing false and absurd accusations against the Pope, charging him with licentious living and cruelty; and with obtaining the Papacy by bribery; and he called upon Hildebrand, "no longer Pope but a false monk," to resign St. Peter's See, which he had usurped. The Prelates also joined him in deposing the Pope. At the Lenten Synod in February, the Pope, in the presence of the King's mother, proceeded to excommunicate and depose the King, and freed his subjects from their allegiance, forbidding any obedience to be paid to him. Henry was allowed a year to make his submission.

There were many who disputed this right, claimed by the Pope, to depose the King. But the Papal Excommunication was no light matter. The German Princes, whose allegiance to the King had waned, began to fall away from him, and welcomed the Pope as an ally. After a Council held at Tribur, in October, they threatened, if the ban of excommunication was not removed by February in the following year, the sentence of deposition would take effect, and his subjects renounce their allegiance. Henry, thoroughly alarmed, determined to throw himself upon the mercy of the inexorable Pope. Gregory was at that time stopping at Canossa, a strong fortress in the Apennines, belonging to Matilda, the rich and powerful Countess of Tuscany. In January, 1077, in the depth of a winter of unusual severity, even in those inclement regions, he, accompanied by his wife Bertha and their infant child, crossed Mount Cenis. With no other attendants, dressed in the garb of a pilgrim, and with bare feet, he was admitted into the second of the three courts of the Castle, where he was detained, standing on the ground, which was covered deep with snow, exposed to privation and suffering from hunger, for three days and nights, and only after that time did the Pope, on the intercession of the Countess Matilda, admit him to an audience.

The King, who was remarkable for his tall and noble per-

son, threw himself at the feet of the little Pope, and accepted all the humiliating conditions which he imposed upon him. The Pope granted him a conditional Absolution.

But the King's troubles were not yet ended. Whilst the Lombards advocated his cause against the Pope, and determined to avenge his insults, the German Princes, on the other hand, avowed their contempt for a man who had thus lowered the kingly dignity, and in a meeting at Forcheim in May, elected Rudolph, Duke of Swabia, as a rival King of Germany. Thus through the action of the Pope, civil war was fomented.

But Gregory had gone too far. For a time, notwithstanding the ban under which he had placed the King, and the reproaches of Rudolph's party, the wily Pope hesitated between the two, and not till Henry had suffered a defeat at Fladenheim, in January, A.D. 1080, did he declare in favour of Rudolph, when he renewed the excommunication of Henry. But to this further humiliation, added to the disgrace of Canossa, the King refused to bend, and retaliated on Gregory in two Councils, one attended by thirteen Bishops, on May 31, at Maintz, and the other at Brixen, in the Tyrol, on June 25. The Pope was branded as "the false monk Hildebrand," a preacher of sacrilegious doctrine, guilty of bribery, the disturber of the Empire, the favourer of the heretic Berengar. His deposition having been decreed, an Antipope, Guibert, Archbishop of Ravenna, was elected, and assumed the title of Clement III. (1080—1100).

Rudolph was killed in battle in October, A.D. 1080, and on Whitsun Eve, 1081, Henry appeared before the walls of Rome. The Papal party elected in August another King of Germany, Hermann of Luxemburg. The Pope refused all terms of reconciliation, and not till A.D. 1084, and after a siege of three years, did Henry gain full possession of Rome. The Antipope was on Palm Sunday consecrated in the Lateran Basilica

by the Bishops of Modena, Arezzo, and Bologna, and by him, on Easter-day, Henry and his wife Bertha were crowned Emperor and Empress in St. Peter's.

Gregory had, on the entrance of the King and Guibert into Rome, taken refuge in the Castle of St. Angelo, and little now seemed to remain for him but to die of hunger, or to submit himself to the Emperor. But in April news was brought to him of the approach to his assistance of a Norman army under their leader, Robert Guiscard. Henry, not considering that he was equal to effectually withstand a force of thirty-six thousand men, drew off his army from Rome, and Guiscard was thus enabled to liberate the Pope. But in order to reduce the hostile city to submission, Guiscard ordered Rome to be set on fire; and to the fire, and a sack which, with all its attending horrors, it underwent for three days, is to be attributed the destruction of many of the noblest monuments of ancient Rome, which had found more merciful enemies in the Goths and Vandals, than in the allies of the Pope. Gregory, finding that the Romans laid to his charge all the calamities of the times, and the ruin of the city, and that Rome was no longer a safe residence for him, withdrew, first to Monte Casino, and then to Salerno, in which latter town a large number of Normans was settled. From Salerno he renewed his Anathemas against the Emperor and the Antipope, and there he died on May 25, A.D. 1085; his final words breathing out the spirit of pride which clung to him to the last, "I have loved justice and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile."

There is no reason for doubting the sincerity of Gregory as a Reformer, nor the morality of his character, nor for disbelieving that the assertions to the contrary by his enemies were unfounded calumnies. But he was a violent man, not addicted to mercy, whose favourite weapon was the Anathema. He found the Papacy at a low ebb; he raised it, but with an immense amount of bloodshed and misery, to a greater height than it had

before attained. He believed that the existing evils of the time were due to the connection between Church and State, which he strove to dis sever. One object which he had always before him was the exaltation of the Clergy. He mistook in thinking that the Clergy were a separate body from the Laity, and that they were the whole Church. But beyond everthing else, he aimed at universal Empire for the Papacy, and as to the means employed he was not particular. The title of Pope, which had been in early times extended to the Archbishops of the principal Sees, had by degrees become restricted to the See of Rome, to which, with perhaps the exception of the Archbishopric of Canterbury, it was, after the time of Gregory VII., solely confined. He compared the Secular and Spiritual powers of the world to the two eyes of the human body; and again to the sun and moon, the greater luminary being the Pope. The "Dictate," a work generally attributed to him, if not actually written by him, embodies his principles. A few extracts will show the extravagant demands which he made for the Papacy. The Roman Pontiff is the Universal Bishop. He alone can depose Bishops, and without a Synod. His Legates, even though of an inferior Order, take precedence in Councils of Bishops, and may depose them. All Princes should kiss his feet. He may depose Kings and Emperors, and free their subjects from allegiance. From his sentence there is no appeal; he can be judged by none. No Council without his sanction can be styled General. The Roman Church never has, and has the testimony of Scripture that it never can err. No one who does not agree with the Roman Church can be called Catholic.

One good, it must be allowed, resulted from all the misery and bloodshed which he caused. If the spirit of the Gospel was absent from his conduct and that of his predecessors, yet the power which he gained, and which they continued to assert, for the Papacy, was the only stronghold and defence during the

later Middle Ages against the tyranny and injustice of the secular power.

His exorbitant claims were allowed by the less powerful European States, but by England and France and Germany they were rejected. A notable instance with regard to England occurs in the case of William the Conqueror.

The Norman Conquest coincides with the time when the Papal pretensions were reaching their highest point. Pope Alexander II. had sanctioned with his blessing William's invasion of England. Hildebrand thinking that this action of his predecessor placed the King under an obligation to the Papacy, demanded through his Legates three years' arrears of Peter-Pence, and required him to do homage for his kingdom.

Peter-Pence was a gift first voluntarily made to the Pope by Offa, King of Mercia (755—796). As there was an Archbishop in Kent and another in Northumbria, Offa wished to raise the See of Lichfield to Metropolitan rank, so as to have an Archbishop in his own kingdom. He accordingly obtained the Pall of a Metropolitan from Pope Hadrian I., not however, as we are informed by Matthew Paris and William of Malmesbury, without the payment of a large bribe to Rome. There was only one Archbishop of Lichfield, which after Offa's death relapsed into its former position. Out of gratitude to the Pope, Offa instituted an annual grant towards the lighting of St. Peter's and for the relief of English pilgrims at Rome. Such was the origin of Peter-Pence; and what was at first a voluntary gift, the Popes afterwards claimed as their right.

With the Pope's demand for money William readily complied, but homage he refused (and his reason is significant), because "I do not find that my predecessors have professed it to yours." And this independence from Rome, William maintained in all his dealings with the Pope. He would not allow any one in his dominions to acknowledge, without his consent, the Pontiff of the city of Rome as *Apostolic Pope*. Papal letters might not be

received, unless he had first seen them himself; no suit might be carried to Rome without his sanction; no Papal Legates might land in England without the royal license.

Equally independent was Lanfranc, who was appointed by William, Archbishop of Canterbury (1070—1088), in the room of Stigand. Hildebrand complained of this independence in an angry and imperious letter (A.D. 1081) to the Archbishop, whom he ordered to go to Rome; "Hitherto you out of pride or negligence have abused our patience . . . By virtue of our Apostolic authority we enjoin you . . . to make your appearance at Rome within four months;" in case of his disobedience, he threatened him with suspension. Lanfranc lived eight years after the receipt of this letter; but we never learn of his obeying the command, and nothing more was heard of the Pope's threat. The days had not come when the Popes could exercise such authority over an Archbishop of Canterbury.

In the middle of the Eleventh Century the Eucharistic Controversy, which had been allowed to slumber since the Ninth Century, was renewed, the principal actors now being Lanfranc and Berengar. Lanfranc, born at Pavia, A.D. 1005, became Prior of the famous Monastery of Bec in Normandy, under its Founder and first Abbot, Herluin. He found a Patron in William, at that time Duke of Normandy, whose wrath however he incurred by opposing his marriage with his cousin Matilda, daughter of the Earl of Flanders, and was in consequence expelled the Dukedom. The marriage was afterwards allowed by a dispensation which Lanfranc procured at Rome, on condition of William and Matilda building at Caen the Abbaye aux Hommes and the Abbaye aux Dames, together with four hospitals. Whilst Lanfranc was Prior of Bec, Berengar, who had (A.D. 1039) been appointed Archdeacon of Angers, addressed to him (A.D. 1049) a letter, in which he claimed a Spiritual Presence as more agreeable to the teaching of SS. Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine of Hippo, than the Corporal Presence as advocated

by Paschasius Radbert^a. Lanfranc, who was at the time in Rome, laid the letter before a Synod under Pope Leo IX., and Berengar was condemned. He was also condemned in other Synods at Vercelli and Paris, but acquitted in one (A.D. 1054) at Tours, where his doctrine found a Patron in Hildebrand, who presided over the Council as Papal Legate. It was in this support given to Berengar that his adversaries found a handle against Hildebrand at the Synod of Brixen^b. Berengar had maintained before the Council at Tours, that "the Consecrated Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of Christ;" meaning thereby a Real, not a Corporal Presence; and with this admission Hildebrand was satisfied.

But in a Lateran Council at Rome (A.D. 1059), under Nicolas II., a recantation was forced upon him by Cardinal Humbert, and Berengar, under fear of death, threw his books into the flames; but again, on his return to France, recanted his recantation. Bitter words passed between him and Lanfranc; Lanfranc wrote a Book against him, and Berengar retorted in still severer language in his Book on the Lord's Supper. We need not carry on the controversy. Again he was summoned before a Council at the Lateran (A.D. 1079), and Pope Gregory could no longer stand by him, but forced on him another recantation. Again on his return to France, he relapsed into his supposed error, but he died in the orthodox Faith, A.D. 1088. Berengar had not the spirit which martyrs were made of, and he acted under fear of death; perhaps his accusers are more to blame than their victim.

Lanfranc had in the meanwhile (A.D. 1070) been appointed to the See of Canterbury, and from that time there is no question but that the Roman doctrine of a Corporal Presence in the Eucharist was generally received in England. But it was a new doctrine, and Transubstantiation was never admitted in any formal document of the Church of England. The Homilies

^a See p. 346.

^b See p. 417.

of Elfric (circ. A.D. 1000), which were held as authoritative, enunciate the doctrine of the Anglo-Saxon Church; the Bread and Wine "are truly, after hallowing, Christ's Body and His Blood, though a ghostly mystery . . . not however Bodily but Spiritually."

Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Casino, was elected to succeed Gregory VII.; but being unwilling to accept the proffered dignity, he for a time sought refuge in the more congenial quiet of Monte Casino, Rome being left for an entire year without a Pope, and wholly in the hands of the Antipope. He, however, at length yielded, and was consecrated as Victor III. (1086—1087), and the Antipope was driven out. But meeting with much opposition, and feeling that he was insecure in Rome, he soon returned to Monte Casino, where he died.

He was succeeded, after the lapse of a year, by Otho, Bishop of Ostia, a Frenchman, educated in the Monastery of Monte Casino, who took the title of Urban II. (1088—1099).

At the Council of Clermont (A.D. 1095), under Urban, which sanctioned the First Crusade, Philip I., King of France, who had separated from his wife Bertha, and gone through the form of marriage with Bertrada, wife of Fulk, Duke of Anjou, for which he had been already threatened by Gregory VII., was excommunicated.

In 1099 the Antipope, Guibert or Clement III., was driven out, and Urban remained in undisturbed possession of Rome. In that year Urban died, the Antipope dying in the following year.

Urban was succeeded by Paschal II. (1099—1118), a Roman Cardinal who had been Abbot of Monte Casino, and under him the contest about Investiture continued. The new Pope, in a Synod at Poitiers (A.D. 1100), again excommunicated Philip for the same reason that he had been excommunicated at Clermont; Philip, although he promised to obey the Council, again fell back into his intercourse with Bertrada.

The last years of Henry IV. were consumed with grief caused by the rebellion of his sons. In 1091 his son Conrad was instigated to rebel against him. Pope Paschal did not think it inconsistent with his duty, as Vicar of Christ, to absolve (A.D. 1104) his son Henry from the oath which he had taken, as the condition of his being crowned King, not to seize the Government during his father's life-time. The unnatural war between the father and his son Henry, owing mainly to the action of the Pope, sent the broken-hearted Emperor to a premature grave, in the fifty-sixth year of his age, and in the fiftieth, first as King and afterwards Emperor of Germany, of his reign.

If Henry IV. had many serious faults and vices, they were in a great measure attributable to the Church, which remained his bitter foe to the end. Two worse instructors than the Archbishops Hanno and Adalbert, he could not have had, whose persistent object, after having forced him from the careful supervision of his mother, was, in furtherance of their own ends, to eradicate all that was good in him, and to encourage his early propensities to vice. Pope Gregory VII., a hard and violent man, never tried to conciliate him, but had one sole object in view, the aggrandisement of the Papal authority. And then came Paschal, who incited, under pretence of religion, his favourite son into rebellion against him.

The relentless enmity of the Church pursued Henry IV. even after his death, and he who was excommunicated during his life, was declared to be excommunicate still. A friendly Bishop, Olbert of Liége, was found to give him Christian burial, but his body was afterwards exhumed, and committed to unconsecrated ground; and it was not till five years afterwards, that it was allowed a rest amongst his ancestors in a consecrated vault in the Cathedral of Spire, to which he himself had been a liberal benefactor.

His son Conrad having died before him, he was succeeded by his younger son, Henry V. (1106—1135), who married Matilda,

daughter of Henry I. of England. Paschal, if he had exercised ordinary judgment, might have known that an unnatural son would not entertain deep feelings of respect for a Pope who had instilled into his mind the precept of rebellion against his father. But as Paschal had sown, so did he reap. He had no longer to contend against an Emperor, prematurely weighed down by years and the misfortunes which he had suffered, but a young and formidable King, not more averse to strife than Paschal himself, and equally determined as his father to maintain the right of Investiture.

Henry, who during the life-time of his father had been profuse in his professions to the Pope, no sooner became King than he threw off all disguise.

Paschal relying on the expected aid of the Normans denounced lay Investiture as a sacrilege. Henry (A.D. 1111) crossed with a formidable army into Italy and met the Pope at Sutri. The Pope disappointed of the Norman aid was forced to submit to the conditions of the King. If the Church consented to give up all its temporal possessions and to content itself with its Tythes and obligations, then the King also would abandon his right of Investiture. This basis of agreement, imposed by the powerful King, being accepted, no doubt very reluctantly, by Paschal, was ratified in St. Peter's at Rome. The temporal possessions were surrendered to the King, who gave up the Investiture, whilst the King guaranteed to the Pope the possession of the Patrimony of St. Peter's. The Pope declared Henry to be Emperor, and gave him the kiss of peace; delaying, however, the act of Consecration.

But the Pope had promised more than he could perform. The Prince-Bishops of Germany were averse to giving up their rich temporal possessions, and found that the Pope, by retaining the Patrimony of St. Peter, alone benefited by the arrangement. Suspicions prevailed in all quarters. The Pope was induced to believe that the King never intended to give up Investiture; the

King, that the concession of the Pope was only a stratagem to induce him to surrender his right. The Pope refused to perform the act of Consecration, and the Imperialists in consequence made the Pope and the Cardinals prisoners. The Romans, who always hated the Germans as much as they were hated by them, now advocated the cause of the Pope ; there was war and bloodshedding in Rome, and the King's life was in danger. At length the captive Pope seeing no other way out of his difficulties gave up the Investiture by Ring and Crozier, he swore never to excommunicate Henry, and performed the Imperial Coronation in St. Peter's. No sooner had the Pope taken the oath than he broke it. A Synod held at Vienne (A.D. 1112) under its Archbishop Guido (afterwards Pope Calixtus II.), declared lay Investiture to be unlawful, and annulled the late agreement as extorted by violence, branding the King as a second Judas and excommunicating him. Henry had departed into Germany. Paschal, who alone was bound by the oath, was persuaded by the Cardinals and Clergy, who were free from such embarrassment, that his conduct was sacrilegious, and a violation of the Church. Paschal in vain searched his conscience for some balm which might exonerate him ; he even thought of resigning the Papacy and adopting the life of a hermit. At last throwing off all restraint, he disavowed the treaty, on the ground that it was extorted by violence, and made by him for the preservation of the possessions of the Church, and to deliver Rome from the dangers which beset it. He agreed in the decisions of the Council ; he did not himself excommunicate the Emperor (this would be to violate the oath which he had taken), but (a rather fine distinction) he consented to its being done by others. In another Council in the Lateran (A.D. 1116), the Infallible Pope declared that he was mere dust and ashes ; and that he had done wrong in signing the agreement, whilst he was prisoner in Henry's power, and which he now anathematised. Henry seeing how little he could trust the Pope, appeared again in the following

year at Rome ; the Pope was forced to seek a refuge in Monte Casino, but returning afterwards, he was, owing to the opposition of the citizens, only able to get possession of the Castle of St. Angelo, where he died A.D. 1118.

In the Pontificates of Urban and Paschal, Anselm, the successor of Lanfranc, was Archbishop of Canterbury (1093—1109), and under him the conflict between Church and State, which had been so long raging on the Continent, commenced, and the matter of Investiture was to be fought out in England.

Anselm, a man of noble birth, was, like Lanfranc, an Italian, having been born at Aosta A.D. 1033. Becoming a monk at Bec, he succeeded Lanfranc as Prior, and, A.D. 1078, Herluin as Abbot. He reluctantly accepted the Archbishopric of Canterbury after it had been vacant more than four years, from the tyrannical William Rufus ; it was, he said, like yoking a feeble sheep with a wild bull. There was a skirmish preliminary to the great one in which he was afterwards engaged, between Rufus and Anselm, arising out of a schism in the Papacy, and the question as to which Pope should be acknowledged in England. This, however, was arranged ; but another quarrel soon broke out, and in June, A.D. 1095, Anselm, dressed in the garb of a pilgrim, left the kingdom to seek out the Pope in Rome.

Pope Urban received him with every mark of honour, greeting him as the *Pope and Patriarch of another world*. He soon stood in need of Anselm's learning, whom he requested to attend the Council of Bari (A.D. 1098), where the great question as to the Procession of the Holy Ghost, which divided the Eastern and Western Churches, was discussed. Anselm gained an easy victory for the Western Cause ; and so delighted was the Pope with his reasoning, that he brought before the Council the treatment which Anselm had met with from the irreligious King, and was only turned from pronouncing an Anathema on Rufus by the intervention of Anselm.

It is not necessary to follow on the history of Anselm during

the remainder of the reign of Rufus. He still remained in exile, and the Pope threatened by his Legates to excommunicate the King. Rufus threatened to tear out their eyes unless they immediately left the kingdom; but dying A.D. 1100, he was succeeded by his brother, Henry I.

In the first year of his reign Henry issued a famous Charter, the parent of the more famous Magna Charta, declaring God's Holy Church to be free; and, in agreement with his profession, when a Papal Legate arrived uninvited in England, "he was sent back as he came." Anselm returned to England on September 23, and the absorbing question of Investiture, whether it belonged to the Spiritual or the Temporal Power to invest Prelates, was at once brought forward.

Henry was equally determined as his father to be supreme in both Civil and Ecclesiastical matters. Investiture by a Temporal Prince had been recently forbidden by a Canon of the Lateran Council, A.D. 1099, at which Anselm himself was present. The King demanded of Anselm that he should receive from him the Crozier and Ring, the emblems of the Spiritual power, and to do homage to him for his Archbishopric. Anselm, who as an Italian had higher notions, than English Bishops, of Rome, refused to be invested on the ground that the practice was forbidden by a Canon Law of that Church. This laid him open to the censure of the King, the Bishops, and the Barons, who could not understand what a Canon Law of Rome had to do with the Common Law of England; and the Bishops declared that they would sooner break off Communion with Rome than sacrifice the National rights.

Still the King, who could not afford to quarrel with the Church, was desirous of coming to terms. His elder brother Robert, the rightful heir to the Throne, had lately returned from the Crusade, covered with honour from the part which he had taken against the Infidels. The King, Barons, and Bishops all agreed that the Pope should act as mediator. Two embassies

which were sent to Rome brought back contradictory answers, one party saying that the Pope favoured the King, the other that he favoured the Archbishop. The Pope knew that the Archbishop was right, but at the same time he hesitated to offend the King. The reference to the Pope only made confusion worse confounded. The King appointed to vacant Sees, and Anselm refused to consecrate. Though the Archbishop of York was willing to take Anselm's place, the Bishops-designate refused consecration at his hands; and from 1101—1107 no Bishops were consecrated to English Sees.

Anselm now, old and infirm as he was, at the request of the King, who also sent his own messenger, a man named Warelwast, went to Rome in April, A.D. 1103. Warelwast told Paschal that Henry would rather give up his Kingdom than Investiture; the Pope, with still greater vehemence, declared that "he would not to save his head suffer him to have it." Still the Pope decided everything in the King's favour. Anselm finding he could not trust the Pope, left Rome, but still unwilling to return to England, took up his residence at Bec.

At last a *via media* being found, it was ratified in a Council at Westminster in August, A.D. 1107, which the King and Prelates and Nobles attended. The King was to receive homage for the Temporalities; but Investiture by Ring and Crozier was conceded to the Church. This is all that Anselm had claimed, and he had no wish of depriving the King of what was undoubtedly his right. Thus the battle of Investiture, which had caused the humiliation of Henry IV. at Canossa; which had caused an Antipope to be set up for ten years; which had led to the sack and ruin of Rome under Robert Guiscard; and for which the haughty and imperious Hildebrand died in exile at Salerno, was gained in England for the Church.

One result of the Norman Conquest was to bring the English Church into nearer conformity with the Church of Rome. No country was more bound to Rome than Normandy, and William

of Normandy turned out the English Bishops, and appointed Norman, or in the case of Lanfranc and Anselm, Italian Bishops to their Sees. These foreign Bishops were Romanists, and they introduced into the English Church Roman doctrines and discipline. One such matter of discipline was Clerical celibacy, which was not a primitive custom, neither was it the rule of the Eastern, nor of the Anglican Church. Clerical celibacy never was enjoined by any early Council or usage. In England, before the time of Dunstan, Clerical marriages were the rule rather than the exception, and even afterwards continued to be an ordinary practice. Clerical celibacy was simply a modern Roman rule. And the historian Du Pin (1657—1719), himself an advocate of celibacy, tells us that when Gregory VII. imposed the law forbidding the Marriage of the Clergy, those of Germany, Italy, and France strongly resented the restriction, as in direct contradiction to the words of St. Paul and the teaching of the Fathers of the Primitive Church. In a Council held A.D. 1074, under Lanfranc, at Winchester, and in two Councils under Anselm, A.D. 1102 and 1108, Clerical celibacy was imposed. Yet notwithstanding, the English Church and Nation in the strongest manner refused to surrender their independence; we shall see this again and again, as the history of the Church proceeds, in the voice of the King and Bishops, and Acts of Parliament; and no other kingdom was so jealous as England of any undue interference of the Popes. Yet it cannot be denied that, though the descendants of the Norman conquerors became in time amongst the most loyal of Englishmen, and as emphatic as the English themselves against Roman encroachments; yet by the Norman Conquest were sown the seeds of Rome's claims of Supremacy in England.

The Cardinals, immediately after the death of Paschal, proceeded to fill the vacancy in the Papacy, and Gelasius II. (1118—1119), who had been a monk at Monte Casino and had befriended Paschal in his troubles, was elected, although not

without violence and opposition from the Nobles of Rome. The Emperor returned to Rome to assert his rights, which had been overlooked, in the election; Gelasius fled from Rome, not so much from fear of the Emperor, as of his own people, the Emperor in vain requesting him to return. The Romans set up an Antipope in the person of Burdinus, Archbishop of Braga, who took the title of Gregory VIII. (1119—1121). Thus there were again two Popes; Gelasius, having in a Synod at Capua excommunicated the Antipope and the Emperor, ventured once more to return to Rome; but, owing to the enmity of the people, he was obliged to lie hidden like a thief, and to celebrate Mass in obscure corners of the city; the Church where he officiated was attacked, and he again fled, dying shortly afterwards in the Abbey of Clugny.

Guido, or Guy, the Archbishop of Vienne, a Frenchman of noble and even royal descent, being connected with the Kings of Burgundy, a man of ability and moderation, succeeded under the title of Calixtus II. (1119—1124). Guido had been sent (A.D. 1100) as Legate into England by Paschal II. It was however declared to be an unprecedented intrusion, and he was obliged to return to Rome, a promise being made to Archbishop Anselm that no Legate should again be sent to England during his Primacy. In a Synod at Rheims, in the first year of his Pontificate, the Pope denounced the Anathema of the Church against the Emperor and the Antipope, and a civil war seemed to be impending in Germany.

All parties, however, had now grown weary of the struggle of Investiture, which had been going on for nearly fifty years. France also counselled peace; both Emperor and Pope saw that moderation was required, and were satisfied to lay aside their extreme claims; and Henry had been advised that he could safely abandon the Investiture by Ring and Crozier. A Council was held, and the Concordat of Worms concluded, A.D. 1122, which was confirmed in the Lateran Council at Rome

in the following year. Free election of Bishops and Abbots, but in the presence of the Emperor or his Legate, was allowed to the Church. If any dispute arose amongst the electors, it should be decided by the Emperor, after consultation with the Bishops. The Prelate elected should do homage to the Emperor for his Temporalities, in which he should be confirmed by the Emperor, but not with the Crozier and Staff (the Spiritual ensigns), but by the Sceptre, the fitting emblem of the Temporal rights.

It was a compromise. The Papacy had not gained all that Gregory VII. aimed at, yet the Empire had a fall, and the victory, if not complete, was at any rate on the side of the Popes. The Investiture conflict, and the alienation of the Emperor from the Church, occurred at the very time when his services were most needed as the Leader of Christendom against the Infidels; to conduct a great Religious war, and to head the Church militant against the enemies of the Faith, was, says Mr. Bryce, the very purpose for which an Emperor had been called into being. The relation of the Emperor to the Popes prevented the former from taking the leading part in the Crusades; and so an extra lustre was added to the See of Rome, which organised and blessed the project.

The conflict between Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, and King Henry II., was a kind of offshoot of the struggle for Investiture. It concerned the union between Church and State, and the relations of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts.

During the anarchy which prevailed in England, both in Church and State, in the reign of King Stephen, the country was reduced to such a miserable condition that it was commonly said that Christ and His Saints slept. Under the name of Clergy was comprised a motley group, descending from the Bishops and Clergy to the Parish clerks and sextons; to all in a word who performed duties in any way connected with the Church and Monasteries. People in order to escape the punish-

ments inflicted by the Normans in the civil courts which were of the cruellest kind, embraced a life which entitled them to rank amongst spiritual persons and so to claim Benefit of Clergy. Amongst this class of persons, crimes of the deepest dye, robberies, adulteries, murders, were of frequent occurrence. Henry II., who was bent on effecting a reform, appointed Becket Archbishop of Canterbury, thinking he would assist him in the task, but he raised up against himself a second Hildebrand.

Becket, born December 21, A.D. 1118, the son of a London Portreve of Norman blood, showing signs of great ability, having received a good early education in England, afterwards studied Theology and acquired a knowledge of Canon and Civil Law in the best Universities of the Continent. In 1144 he was ordained Deacon by Archbishop Theobald; in 1154 appointed Archdeacon of Canterbury, the most lucrative Church appointment, next to that of a Bishopric, in England, and on the death of Theobald, A.D. 1162, succeeded him in the Primacy.

Becket whilst a Deacon, although a man of strict morality, had led the life of a layman, and joined the King in his sports and amusements. But the Court of the good Archbishop Theobald in which he had resided was a strict school in which to learn the duties of a Bishop; no one ever accused Becket of duplicity, and Becket was not the man to accept an office and to shirk its duties. With many virtues he had many faults, and was a man of lower character than Anselm, with a temper as passionate as that of Henry himself, lacking humility and not averse to strife; that he was wrong-headed few deny.

The separation by William the Conqueror of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts was the cause of all Becket's troubles. The chief contention between the Archbishop and the King was this; Becket insisted that all Clerical offenders should be judged by the Spiritual Court and punished according to the Canon Law; Henry, in a Council of Bishops and Abbots at

Westminster in October, A.D. 1163, claimed that being convicted in the Civil Court, they should be degraded by the Church and then handed over to the Civil Magistrate for punishment. The Prelates sided with the King^c. Alexander III. (1159—1181), who was then Pope of Rome, wished to stand well with the powerful King of England, and by his advice Becket promised an unconditional obedience to the customs of the Realm. The Constitutions of Clarendon were accordingly drawn up on January 25, A.D. 1164. By one Constitution which forbade appeals being carried out of England, appeals to the Pope were forbidden. The general effect was to lower the status of the Church, and to grant an appeal from the Ecclesiastical to the Civil Courts.

Becket when he heard them was so taken by surprise that he declared that Christ was now to be judged anew by Pilate. At first he refused to sign the Constitutions, but eventually under pressure from the Barons consented, and the Constitutions of Clarendon became for a time the Law of the land.

Becket, when he fully realised what he had done, was overwhelmed with grief, and on December 2, A.D. 1164, effected his escape from England to lay his case before the Pope at Sens in France, and to submit to any penance which he might think fit to impose. At the time there was another schism in the Papacy, and whilst Victor III. ruled in Rome, Alexander III., who was recognised by England, was a fugitive, and held his Court at Sens. Becket lamenting with tears in his eyes the miserable condition of the Church of England, resigned his Archbishopric to the Pope, by whom he was reinstated; but though highly indignant at the Constitutions of Clarendon the Pope feared to offend the King, and never gave Becket the support to which he was entitled. Becket then leaving Sens, adopted the monastic habit and the strict discipline of the Cistercian monks, at Pontigny.

Another cause of quarrel, on which, however, we need not

^c See p. 448.

dwell, occurred between the King and the Archbishop, with regard to the relative rights of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York.

Events now hurried on to the bitter end; the King of France threatened Henry with war, the Pope threatened him with excommunication. The King and Archbishop met at Fretville on July 22, A.D. 1170. Becket threw himself at the King's feet, and the King in his turn held the stirrup of the Archbishop's horse. Becket, with the King's permission, returned to England, under the conviction that he was returning to certain death.

On December 1 he landed in England, and proceeded to Canterbury, where he was welcomed with the joyful acclamations of the citizens, rich and poor alike. He immediately excommunicated the English Bishops who had opposed him, thus thoroughly exasperating the king, who still continued on the Continent. His martyrdom in Canterbury Cathedral, which occurred on December 29, is sufficiently known not to need repeating.

The brutal murder sent a thrill of horror through Christendom; it was described as even worse than the Crucifixion, because the murderers were not Jews but professing Christians. No one was more horrified than the King himself, whose hasty words had occasioned the crime. Dreading excommunication from the Pope, he conceded everything, at least in words, for which Becket had contended. He renounced the Constitutions of Clarendon; he allowed appeals to be made to Rome, and swore to recognise Alexander, and no other, as Pope. And on these terms he was absolved by the Pope's Legates at Avranches on September 27, A.D. 1172.

Two years after his death Becket was canonised. Troubles at home fell thick on the head of the unhappy King, all of which he was told were due to the murder of Becket; he must do Penance at the tomb of the martyred Saint, and thus make

his peace with the Church. Landing in England on July 8, A.D. 1174, and fasting on bread and water, he arrived on July 12 at Canterbury. Laying aside the emblems of Royalty, dressed in the guise of a pilgrim, with a hair shirt next his skin, his bare feet bleeding from the rough stones, he entered the Cathedral. Proceeding to the *Martyrdom*, he knelt down and kissed the stone on which the Saint had fallen, and descending into the crypt, kissed his tomb. He then bared his back, and received stripes, in all eighty, from every Prelate and every monk present. He then received Absolution, and after fasting the whole night in the crypt, and hearing Mass in the morning, he started for London ; and when we are told that the journey lasted a whole week, we may judge of the severity of the Penance.

Thus both in Germany and England, in the conflict between Church and State, the Church triumphed. But in England it was a barren victory. The principle for which Becket had contended, viz., the immunity of the Clergy from Secular Jurisdiction, was abandoned at a Council on March 12, A.D. 1176, when the right of impeaching the Clergy in the Secular Courts for certain civil offences was conceded to the King.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE PAPACY AT ITS HEIGHT.

ST. BERNARD—Pope Honorius II. explains away the Concordat of Worms—Pope Innocent II. and Lothaire II.—Succession of the Hohenstaufens to the Empire—Lateran Council of 1139—Monastic Reform—The Clugniac Order—The Camaldolites—The Monks of Vallombrosa—The Grandimontanes—Carthusians—Cistercians—St. Bernard enters the Order—Founds the Monastery of Clair-Vaux—Denounces the corruptions of the Papacy—Premonstratensians—Carmelites—The Military Orders—Abelard—Arnold of Brescia—The Roman Republic—Pope Eugenius III.—Nicolas Breakspear, an Englishman, becomes Pope—The Emperor Barbarossa—Execution of Arnold—Pope Alexander III. and the Antipopes—Submission of Barbarossa at Venice—Renewed wars between the Pope and Emperor—Capture of Jerusalem by Saladin—Innocent III., Pope—Puts forth the highest pretensions for the Papacy—Claims the right of deciding in a disputed Election to the Empire—The Guelphs and Ghibellines—Innocent places France under an Interdict—King John of England—Stephen Langton—England becomes a Fief of Rome—Magna Charta signed—Langton suspended by the Pope—Lateran Council of 1215—Transubstantiation made a doctrine of the Roman Church—Pope Gregory IX. and the Emperor Frederic II.—St. Louis, King of France, and the Papacy—Council of Lyons—England complains of Papal exactions—Frederic II., called the *Wonder of the World*, persecuted by the Popes—Pope Clement IV. and the Emperor Paleologus—Execution of Conradin—Second Council of Lyons—New Canon as to the Election of Popes—Temporary reconciliation between East and West—The Sicilian Vespers—Celestine V., Pope—Boniface VIII., Pope—His contest with Philip the Fair of France and Edward I. of England—England's independence of the Popes—Reign of Henry III. of England—Papal exactions in England—St. Edmund Rich, Archbishop of Canterbury—Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln—Sewall, Archbishop of York—Simon de Montfort—Battles of Lewes and Evesham—Rise of Parliament—Edward I. and Convocation—The Bull *Clericis Laicis*—Pope Boniface's Claim on Scotland—Parliaments of Lincoln and Carlisle—Boniface and the Gallican Clergy—The Bull *Ineffabilis*—The Jubilee, A.D. 1300—The Bull *Ausculta Fili*—Unam Sanctam—Seizure of Boniface at Anagni—His death.

THE great ornament of the Church in the Twelfth Century was St. Bernard (1091—1153), a man born of a noble family at Fontaines, near Dijon. He has been called the Last of the

Fathers, the last, that is, of those who followed the Patristic method of treating questions of Divinity, instead of the Scholastic Theology which was in his time in vogue. Bernard exerted a wider and more general influence than perhaps has ever fallen to the lot of any private individual, before or since his time ; the arbitrator between Princes ; the friend and counsellor of Popes ; the champion of orthodoxy and confounder of heretics ; the promoter of a Crusade ; the reviver of monasteries.

Throughout the Twelfth Century the History of the Popes continues to be the History of the Church. The Battle of Investitures had ended in the Concordat of Worms ; but war with the Emperors still continued to be the policy of the Popes.

Pope Calixtus dying, A.D. 1124, was succeeded by Honorius II. (1124—1130) ; by the death of Henry V. (A.D. 1125), without children, the Franconian Line of Emperors came to an end. He was succeeded by Lothaire II. (1125—1137), Duke of Saxony, who was elected over Frederick, Duke of Suabia, a member of the Hohenstaufen family. There was thus a division created in the Empire ; the Pope sided with Lothaire, thus laying the seeds of the enmity between the Popes and the Hohenstaufens. It was the policy of Lothaire to cultivate the friendship of the Pope, to whom he not only submitted, but humiliated himself, and the Pope took advantage of the occasion. He claimed that the Concordat of Worms was confined to the Emperor Henry V., and did not extend to his successors ; that the Election of Prelates need not be controlled by the presence of the Emperor ; that the Emperor should Invest the Bishop Elect in the Temporalities of the Sceptre, but without the homage.

On the death of Honorius, another schism occurred in the Papacy. Two Cardinals were elected to the vacant See, Peter, a converted Jew, who, with the support of the majority of the Sacred College, took the title of Anacletus II. (1130—1138), and to the time of his death held possession of the Vatican ; and Gregory, who took the title of Innocent II. (1130—1143).

The cause of the latter was espoused by St. Bernard, whose wonderful influence now began to manifest itself; he obtained for Innocent the recognition of the King of France, whose example was followed by Henry I. of England, and by Lothaire. Innocent long lived in exile in France; he was, however, brought back to Rome by Lothaire, whom he crowned Emperor, not, as was usual, in St. Peter's (the Antipope holding possession of the right bank of the Tiber), but in the Lateran. In a picture erected in the Lateran to commemorate the event, the Emperor was represented as prostrate at the Pope's feet, and under the picture was this inscription:—

“Rex stetit ante fores, jurans prius urbis honores;
Post homo fit Papæ, sumit quo dante coronam.”

The death of the Emperor, in December, 1137, made way for the line of the Hohenstaufens, the first Emperor of which was Conrad III. (1138—1152), son of a daughter of the late Emperor Henry IV., and the representative of the Anti-Papal party, who was crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, but never received the Imperial Crown at Rome.

On the death (A.D. 1138) of the Antipope, Anacletus, another Antipope, Victor IV., was set up; but after two months the schism was healed through the intervention of St. Bernard.

In 1139, a great Council, attended by a thousand Bishops and a large number of Abbots, (the largest Council which had ever yet been held), assembled in the Lateran under Innocent II. Canons were passed against Simony and the marriage of the Clergy. The Clergy were made mere vassals of the Pope; but for a layman to lay hands on a Priest or a Monk was to incur an Anathema for sacrilege, only to be absolved on a death-bed. By this Council, Arnold of Brescia^a was condemned.

The life of St. Bernard brings into prominence the subject of Monasticism. We have seen how St. Benedict of Nursia had

^a See below, p. 445.

given a Rule to the Monks of the West^b; and how, when that Rule was evaded or entirely neglected, a reform had been attempted by St. Benedict of Aniane^c. The reform effected by the latter succeeded for a time, but the severity of his Rule rendered his system intolerable, so that after his death a reaction set in, and the condition of the Monasteries became worse than ever.

At the beginning of the Tenth Century an important reformation was effected at Clugny in Burgundy, under its first Abbot Berno (A.D. 910), and his successor Odo (927—941), which imposed a very stringent and ascetic Code of laws. This Order was generally adopted by the Western Monks, and no fewer than two thousand monasteries became affiliated to it. But it soon acquired great revenues; its Rule was evaded, and by the Twelfth Century a general corruption and laxity of morals pervaded its members.

In the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries a great increase took place in the number of the Monastic Orders, mostly in obedience to the Rule of St. Benedict of Nursia. St. Romuald, a member of a noble family at Ravenna, thinking thus to atone for a murder committed by his father, at the age of twenty entered the Benedictine monastery of Classis, a few miles from Ravenna, where he spent seven years. But his fervour and austerity so stirred up the Monks against him that, in danger of his life, he retired to a place called Campo Maldoli or Camaldoli, near Arezzo in Tuscany, and there founded, about A.D. 1020, the Order of the Camaldolites.

Gualbert (or St. John Gualbert), a native of Florence, having visited the monks of Camaldoli, determined himself to found a monastery; so, departing thence through a valley called Vallis Umbrosa (*shady valley*) he instituted, about A.D. 1028, the Order of the Monks of Vallombrosa, about twenty miles from Florence.

^b See p. 272.

^c See p. 368.

St. Stephen, the son of a nobleman of Auvergne, led for forty years the life of a Hermit at Muret, a desolate mountain in the neighbourhood of Limoges. After his death, a neighbouring Priory having claimed Muret as its possession, the disciples of Stephen retired to Grammont, a few miles distant, from which place the order of Grandimontanes took its name, A.D. 1073.

In 1084, the Order of the Carthusians was founded by St. Bruno, a native of Cologne and a Canon of Rheims, who had been Tutor of Pope Urban II., in the valley of La Grande Chartreuse near Grenoble. St. Hugh, the Bishop of Grenoble, gladly welcomed him and his companions, but at the same time warned him of the difficulties which he would have to encounter in so wild a spot, which was for nearly the whole year covered with snow, and considered uninhabitable. Soon an Oratory, with a few Cells at a short distance from each other, was built; this was the origin of the Order of the Carthusians, or Monks of the Chartreuse, which is converted into the English Charter-House. The Rule which the Order adopted was of the strictest kind, and escaped the general deterioration which seemed inherent in the Monastic system.

The Cistercian Order was founded, about A.D. 1098, by Robert (St. Robert), Abbot of Molesme in Burgundy. A few of the more fervent Monks, offended with the lay discipline which generally prevailed in that Monastery, induced the Abbot to lead them to some more solitary place, where they might be better able to carry out the Benedictine Rule. Robert thereupon accompanied them to a desolate forest called Cistercium or Citeaux, in the neighbourhood of Dijon, which was watered by a little river; and thence the Cistercian Order took its origin and name, and carried out the strictest observance of the Rule of St. Benedict. The Monks of Molesme could not do without him; so, at the request of Pope Urban II., Robert resigned the Abbacy of Citeaux, and was installed anew as Abbot of Molesme, where he died about A.D. 1110.

St. Alberic, who succeeded Robert as Abbot of Citeaux, was on his death, A.D. 1109, succeeded by Stephen, an Englishman of a rich and honourable family, who raised the Order to a high standard of excellence. In 1113, during the time that Stephen was Abbot, St. Bernard, with his five brothers and his sister, joined the Order, and under his auspices the Cistercians rapidly spread through every part of Europe. The number of Monks soon outgrew the Monastery, so that Bernard, having received the Crozier and rank of Abbot from Stephen, went forth with twelve Monks, amongst whom were his brothers, and founded a new Monastery at Clair-Vaux (Clara Vallis, *bright Valley*), where through his asceticism he incurred an illness (A.D. 1116) which brought him to the point of death. Here his father joined him, (his mother had died during his childhood,) assumed the habit of a monk, and died in his arms. Here too Bernard, having refused all higher dignities, died as Abbot A.D. 1153; leaving more than a hundred and sixty Monasteries which owed their foundation to him, and having had the satisfaction of seeing a Pope, six Cardinals, and more than thirty Bishops, chosen from the number of his disciples. He was (A.D. 1165) canonised by Pope Alexander III.

St. Bernard, the friend and adviser of Popes, was a precursor of the Reformers of the Church. He denounced in the plainest language to Pope Eugenius III. the corruptions of the Papacy and pretensions of the Popes, as not primitive but modern, not founded on St. Peter, but on Constantine the Great.

The Order of Premonstratensians (a connecting link between the Regular and Secular Clergy) was founded A.D. 1119, in the Pontificate of Calixtus II., by St. Norbert, a Canon of Premonstré, in the Diocese of Laon. Himself a Secular, he founded the Order for the better education of Clergy in general, with a view to which he endeavoured to combine the Secular and Religious life. Combining the life of Monks with the duties of Parish Priests, the White Canons, as they were called from their

dress, spread over Europe, and are said to have had thirty-five Houses in England.

The Carmelites were the precursors of the Mendicant Orders, and though established in this century, put forth a further development, as White Friars, in the next. Though they themselves professed to trace up their origin to Elijah, who made Carmel the place of his retreat, their name was really derived from their having been formed into a community, A.D. 1160, on Mount Carmel, by Berthold, a Calabrian.

The Crusades gave an impulse to the Monastic Orders. Chief amongst the Military Orders which took their rise at that time, were the Knights Hospitallers, or the Knights of St. John the Baptist of Jerusalem, so called from their connection with a hospital founded for the benefit of pilgrims, when Jerusalem was in the hands of the Saracens; and the Knights Templars, who derived their name from their residing in a house on the supposed site of the ancient temple at Jerusalem. These Orders consisted of Knights, bound by the same rules as the Canons Regular, but devoted to fight for the defence of the Holy Land against the Unbelievers. The Hospitallers were distinguished by a black dress with a white Cross, the Templars by a white dress with a red Cross.

A Third Order were the Teutonic Knights of St. Mary of Jerusalem, which, founded by some Germans after the siege of Acre during the Crusades, was entirely composed of Germans; it was established for a similar purpose as the two other military Orders, in distinction from which the members wore black Crosses on white habits.

A spirit of religious and political discontent had long manifested itself amongst the Romans, who having grown weary of the long contentions between the Popes and Emperors, and of the losses that they suffered through the frequent absences of the Popes from Rome, began now to clamour for a Republic and a Senate on the ancient model.

Foremost among the doctrinal Reformers was Abelard, (1079—1142,) a native of a village near Nantes, a man of great learning, and (if we could forget his unfortunate connection with his pupil Heloise, a daughter of a Canon of Paris, whom, however, he eventually married), a man of blameless character. But there can be little doubt that his Theological teaching was of a rationalistic and heretical character. Bernard (who, however, was never kindly disposed to him) accuses him of trying to explain incomprehensible mysteries, of giving reasons for what is above reason, and of believing nothing but what human Reason can explain. He describes him as, with regard to the Trinity, resembling Arius, with regard to Grace, Pelagius, with regard to the Person of our Lord, Nestorius.

Having parted from Heloise, whom also he persuaded to take the veil, Abelard became a Monk in the Monastery of St. Denys. Here, however, he got into trouble, through questioning the popular belief of the identity of St. Denys, the Patron Saint of France, with Dionysius the Areopagite; and soon left the Monastery. He, unlike Bernard, who followed the old paths, adopted the Dialectic or Scholastic treatment, which was at that time popular, of Theological subjects. A Book which he wrote (an *Introduction to Theology*) was condemned in a Synod at Soissons (A.D. 1120), he himself compelled to withdraw its statements, and the Book committed to the flames. Again (A.D. 1140) Bernard brought before the Council of Sens some objectionable passages from another of his Books, on which he grounded accusations of Pelagianism concerning Grace, and of Arianism and Nestorianism with regard to the Trinity. Abelard being condemned, appealed to the Pope. But at Rome Bernard was all-powerful, and Abelard was again condemned. He then sought a refuge at Clugny, and died (A.D. 1142) in one of the monasteries of that order, near Chalons. Heloise, who survived him for more than twenty years, was buried in the same grave with him in the Convent

called the Paraclete, which he himself had founded, and over which he had placed her as Abbess.

Pope Innocent II. was no less pretentious nor arbitrary in his demands than his predecessors had been ; and it was in his Pontificate that Arnold of Brescia (circ. 1105—1154) arose as a Reformer. Arnold did not attack the Doctrines of the Church, and, although some of his opinions as derived from his teacher Abelard, might be open to question, yet he was generally orthodox. He was a popular and political, rather than a dogmatic, Reformer ; but he found, as Abelard had before him, an opponent in Bernard.

Arnold desired freedom for Rome, and was opposed, not to the spiritual authority, but the temporal aggrandisement of the Popes. He, like Wicliffe after him, charged the Clergy and the Monks on the ground of their holding property and assuming temporal power. He maintained that as Christ had said that His Kingdom was not of this world, Bishops and Priests, by holding property and exercising Temporal power, put themselves outside the pale of salvation ; and that endowments should be taken from the Church and bestowed upon laymen.

His novel and outspoken sentiments gained for him enemies amongst the Bishops and Clergy, by whom he was accused before, and condemned by, the Lateran Council of 1139. He then went to Zurich ; his teaching, which had struck a deep root in Brescia, now found powerful adherents in Switzerland, where he was able to draw for a time to his side the Bishop of Constance, and even the Papal Legate. They were soon, however, reclaimed by St. Bernard. Arnold found a friend in the successor of Innocent II., Pope Celestine III. (1143—1144), a former pupil of Abelard, and through him he was enabled to return to Rome. There a revolution accompanied with much blood-shedding was effected ; a Republic was formed, a Senate established, and a *Patrician*, in place of the Papal Prefect, ruled in the Capitol. The Republic continued (1144—1154) under five Popes. Celes-

tine, the friend of Arnold, was Pope for less than six months. Next to him followed Lucius II. (1144—1145). Notwithstanding his determination to put them down, the Republic and Senators continued to gather strength and cohesion; they declared to the Pope that they would recognise only his Spiritual authority; they gained possession of Rome; the Cardinals were assaulted, and their houses destroyed, and the Pope was killed in the tumult.

The next Pope, Eugenius III. (1145—1153), a Cistercian Monk, the friend and admirer of Bernard, and consequently the enemy of Abelard and Arnold, was elected in the hope that he would be able to quell the insurrection. Eugenius placed himself at the head of the anti-republican movement. But he saw that gentleness was likely to effect what arms could not. He was contented to rule at Rome in his Spiritual capacity alone, and to the Spiritual authority of the Popes the Republicans had never demurred. The amiability of his character, and his contempt of riches, gained the hearts of the people, who yearned after their former glory under the Spiritual Head of Christendom; and the power of Arnold was gradually waning away. Eugenius also gained some temporary success over the Revolutionists. Arnold was however enabled to gain possession of Rome, and Eugenius, being required to recognise the Republic, fled to France, where the greater part of his Pontificate was spent in exile.

Eugenius died in July, A.D. 1153, the year before St. Bernard.

Anastasius IV. succeeded him, but only for one year. Nicolas Breakspear, the next Pope, who, it may be mentioned, was, like several of his predecessors, the son of a Priest, the only Englishman who ever held the Papacy, took the title of Hadrian IV. (1154—1159). Hadrian, a man of great learning, who had been a Monk at St. Albans, passed over to France, where he became a Monk, and subsequently Abbot, of the Monastery at Arles, and was afterwards appointed a Cardinal by Eugenius III.

He now adopted vigorous measures against the Republic, and during Lent placed the Roman citizens under an Interdict, the banishment of Arnold from Rome being the condition of their Absolution.

On the death of Conrad III. his nephew Frederick I., surnamed Barbarossa (*red beard*), succeeded to the Empire (1152—1190). Frederick, one of the most powerful of all the Emperors, asserted that his title was derived from God alone, and claimed an unfounded Supremacy over all powers, Spiritual and Temporal. Hadrian, who had risen from a state of poverty to the supreme Headship of Christendom, carried out the Hildebrandine principles to the furthest extreme, and was as haughty in his claims for Spiritual Supremacy as any of his predecessors. Leaving Rome to meet the King at Sutri, he refused to give him the kiss of peace unless he consented to hold his stirrup, a service which, with a high flight of imagination, the Pope told him had been performed by Constantine the Great for Pope Sylvester. The King at first demurred, but ultimately, treating the matter as a mere frivolous joke, consented; but when he acted so clumsily as to hold the wrong stirrup, on the remonstrance of the Pope, he excused himself on the ground that the Hohenstaufens had not had much experience in the duties of a groom.

However, the difficulty was surmounted and the duty performed, and the King and Pope entered Rome together. Hadrian lost no time in demanding the surrender into his hands, and the execution, of Arnold as a man dangerous alike to the Church and Empire. Frederic, having not yet been crowned, was willing to oblige the Pope; Arnold was delivered to the Papal authorities, and having been condemned was first hung, and afterwards burnt, his ashes being thrown into the Tiber for fear lest his remains should be collected, and worship paid him as to a Martyr. With Arnold's death the Roman Republic came to an end.

Frederic was then crowned in St. Peter's. Quarrels between the Emperor and Pope, only to be ended at the death of the latter, quickly followed. Hadrian went so far as to speak of his having conferred favours (*beneficia*) on the Emperor, which was interpreted to mean that the Empire was a Fief of the Papacy. Although the Pope tried to explain away this obnoxious expression, the Emperor was highly indignant; he would rather, he said, risk his life, than submit to such insolence; that he held the Empire from God alone by the election of the Princes, and that he would rule the Clergy like the rest of his people. The Emperor complained of the *pride* inherent in the Chair of St. Peter. The German Bishops sided with the Emperor; the Pope threatened to excommunicate him. The Popes, he said, were placed above the Kingdoms of the world; it was a Pope who had conferred the Empire on the Germans; the King of the Germans was not Emperor before he was crowned by the Pope; and what the Popes gave, they could also take away. An imminent rupture was only averted by the death of Hadrian.

There were two opposing parties in Rome, and by them, on the death of Hadrian, two Cardinals were put into competition for the Papacy. Alexander III. (1159—1181), a man of equally strong Hildebrandine principles as his predecessor, was elected by a majority of the Cardinals, and had the support of England, France, and Spain; the Emperor supported Victor IV. (1159—1164), and followed the now established custom of holding his stirrup. Neither of the two rival Popes was consecrated at Rome.

Pope Alexander had two years previously greatly exasperated the Emperor by advocating the cause of Hadrian and by his extravagant claims for the Papacy, in asserting that the Emperor held his Crown from the Pope. The Emperor summoned both the Popes to attend a Council at Pavia (A.D. 1160). Alexander refused to attend on the plea that an Emperor could not call

a Council without the consent of the Pope ; this was either a pious fraud or an ignorance of history ; he also maintained that a Pope could be judged by no man. The Council decided in favour of the Emperor's Pope, Victor. The parties at once proceeded to extremities ; Alexander excommunicated the Emperor and Victor, and Victor excommunicated Alexander. Alexander celebrated Mass in the Lateran Basilica ; but, meeting with much opposition, he in June, A.D. 1160, retired to France, where he was met by the Kings of France and England, who, holding the bridle of his horse, walked by his side. In 1163 he took up his residence at Sens, where, as we have seen in the previous chapter, he was visited by Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury.

On the death of Victor, another Antipope, Guido of Crema, was elected, and supported by the Emperor, under the title of Paschal III. (1164—1168). Alexander returned to Rome at the end of 1165. In 1167 the Emperor, after a siege, gained possession of the Leonine city and the Vatican, and on July 30 he and the Queen were crowned in St. Peter's Emperor and Empress by the Antipope. Alexander escaped in the garb of a pilgrim from Rome to Benevento.

The schism had been unwisely prolonged by the Emperor, whom troubles soon beset. A violent pestilence which broke out in Rome caused fearful havoc in his army. The Lombard cities combined in a league against him, and found a welcome ally in Alexander. The Emperor returned to Germany, A.D. 1168, and the Antipope died in September of the same year. A new Antipope, Calixtus III. (1168—1178) was elected, but was of little service to the Emperor, and the cause of Alexander gained ground. The Martyrdom of Becket in December, A.D. 1170, and the Penance which King Henry of England performed at the will of Alexander, redounded to the prestige of the rightful Pope.

The Emperor now made overtures for a reconciliation with Alexander, but each refused the terms offered by the other.

In 1176 the Italian cities gained a decisive victory at Legnano over the Emperor, who being forced to sue for peace, sought the mediation of Alexander, acknowledging him as rightful Pope, and abjuring the Antipope. The chief points of dispute between the two having been, not without difficulty, arranged, they met at Venice, A.D. 1177, in the great Piazza of San Marco. There the Emperor, laying aside his Imperial robes, prostrated himself, and kissed the Pope's feet. On the following day he repeated the process; and after Mass held the Pope's stirrup. The peace thus effected between the Church and the Empire having been ratified at a Council in St. Mark's, Alexander took possession of Rome. The excommunication of the Emperor was removed. The Antipope Calixtus, who abdicated A.D. 1178, received a free pardon from Alexander, and when a new Antipope, under the title of Innocent III. (1178—1190), was elected, he was sent by Alexander a prisoner to the monastery of La Cava. Thus the long battle, in Alexander's Pontificate, between the Pope and Emperor was ended; the great Emperor had suffered a defeat scarcely less humiliating than Canossa, and the signal victory of the Papacy over the Empire was assured.

In 1179 Alexander, with the view of correcting abuses which had crept into the Church, convened a Council to the Lateran. The constantly recurring disputes in the election of the Popes led to an alteration being sanctioned at the Council. It was determined that future elections should be vested in the Cardinals alone, the votes of two-thirds of their number being requisite for a valid election; whosoever should set up an Antipope should be anathematised. The several Lateran Councils, which were held at different times, although claimed as such by the Roman Church, cannot be considered as General Councils, as they were not attended by the Eastern Bishops.

Alexander III. died A.D. 1181. The change made by the late Council in the election of the Popes was far from being acceptable to the Roman Clergy and people, who were by

it deprived of their voice in the election. They now vented their wrath on Lucius III. (1181—1185), who was translated by the voice of the Cardinals alone from his See of Ostia to succeed Alexander III., by driving him from Rome and otherwise maltreating him, and he was compelled to take refuge at Velletri.

Notwithstanding the recent truce, the war between the Pope and Emperor broke out again under the next Pope, Urban III. (1185—1187). Urban, who continued to hold together with the Papacy the Archbishopric of Milan, refused in that capacity to Crown the Emperor's son, the future Emperor, Henry VI., as King of Italy, and the Coronation was consequently performed by the Bishop of Aquileia. Barbarossa attacked the Pope for this disloyal conduct, charging him with encroaching on the Imperial rights. The Pope accused the Emperor with appropriating to himself the property of the Church, and confiscating the revenues of the convents. But Urban was pursued with the same hostility by the people of Rome, and on the same grounds, as his predecessor, and was only prevented by their opposition from excommunicating the Emperor.

Urban, who is said to have died from grief on receiving news of the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin, was succeeded by Gregory VIII., who, however, only survived his election two months (October—December, 1187).

Under Clement III. (1187—1191) the Third Crusade^d, which was at first led by Barbarossa, and in which Philip Augustus of France and Richard Cœur de Lion played a conspicuous part, was vigorously taken up.

The next Pope, elected at the age of eighty-five, was Cardinal Hyacinth, who took the title of Celestine III. (1191—1198). The great Emperor Barbarossa was, to the great loss of the Crusading army and the dismay of Christendom, drowned on June 10, A.D. 1190, whilst crossing a narrow river near Tarsus. The first act of the Pope was to crown in St. Peter's his son,

^d See Chap. XIV.

Henry VI. (1191—1197), as Emperor. The new Emperor, although he for his own ends advocated a Crusade, was a bitter foe to the Church and to the Papacy, and it was generally believed that his death was caused by poison administered by the Empress for cruelty towards her relations. Celestine died at the beginning of 1198, a few months after the Emperor.

The Thirteenth Century was the period in which the Papacy reached its greatest height. We have now arrived at the Pontificate of Innocent III. (1198—1216), one of the ablest and most powerful, and in many respects one of the best, of the Popes. From the time of Gregory VII., the idea that the Pope was God's Vicar upon earth, and the Governour of the whole world, and the subjectivity to him of all earthly Princes had been so persistently and successfully maintained, that there is little cause for wonder that a powerful Pope like Innocent raised the Papacy to a still greater height. His pretensions went beyond, and were far more extravagant than those of any of his predecessors; he claimed an inherent supremacy in the Spiritual over the Temporal Power, as that of the Soul over the body, of Eternity over time, of Christ over Cæsar, of God over man.

Lothaire was, whilst still a Deacon, at the early age of thirty-seven, elected Pope, and took the title of Innocent III. Frederic II., a boy under two years of age, who, as the son of Henry VI., a grandson of Barbarossa, was the heir of the Hohenstaufens, was on account of his age set aside in favour of two candidates, Philip of Hohenstaufen, the brother of his father, and Otto, Duke of Saxony, nephew of King Richard of England. The Pope, who claimed the right of deciding the contest, gave his decision in favour of Otto, who belonged to the Guelph family, the persistent foes of the Hohenstaufens. Otto was crowned King of Germany at Aix-la-Chapelle, Philip being crowned at Mayence, by the respective Bishops of those Sees, each of them being profuse in their promises of good-will towards the Pope and the Church.

Philip having (A.D. 1208) fallen under the hand of an assassin at Bamberg, Otto IV. (1209—1218) was crowned in St. Peter's, Emperor, by Innocent, professing that he was raised to that dignity "by the grace of God and the Apostolic See." No sooner was he crowned than, though he was at the same time ready to uphold the Spiritual rights of the Pope, he began to assert the just prerogatives of the Empire. Innocent thereupon transferred his allegiance from the Guelphs, the hereditary allies, to the Ghibellines, the opponents, of the Popes. In 1210, and again A.D. 1212, the Pope anathematised the Emperor, and freed his subjects from their allegiance. Otto having managed to incur unpopularity in Germany, was declared by the Princes to have forfeited the Empire; they then elected Frederick II., who had by that time reached the age of sixteen, the Pope signifying his approval. Thus the Pope was at first the champion of the youthful Frederic, between whom and the Holy See the fatal contest was soon to arise, which embittered his own life and caused the extinction of the family of the Hohenstaufens. Otto's defeat by Philip Augustus, A.D. 1214, sealed his fate; and in the following year Frederic received the Crown at Aix-la-Chapelle, binding himself at the same time to proceed on a Crusade.

Meanwhile contests in other quarters occupied the attention of Innocent, and powerful Princes of the world were to be made to bow to his Supremacy, before the great contest with the German Empire commenced.

Philip Augustus, King of France, who had (A.D. 1193) taken as his second wife Ingeburga, sister of the King of Denmark, conceiving a violent dislike to her, discovered that the marriage was within the prohibited degrees of affinity, so he discarded her in favour of Agnes of Merania. Innocent, as soon as he became Pope, placed his kingdom under an interdict. The King, who at first met it with defiance, speedily gave way, and the interdict was removed A.D. 1200. Agnes died in the next year, but not till 1213 did Philip perform his promise to the

Pope and receive back Ingeberga, with whom he afterwards lived till her death, A.D. 1223.

Having interdicted an Emperor of Germany and King of France, Innocent proceeded to another conquest that was to gain for the See of Rome a temporary triumph over England. John, its weak and vacillating King, was to be brought into open hostility with the powerful Pope, who knew his own strength, and was determined to use it to the utmost.

John and the Monks of Canterbury being at variance as to the election of an Archbishop in succession to Hubert, who died in July, A.D. 1205, as both parties were in the wrong, Innocent took advantage of their differences, and himself elected and consecrated Stephen Langton, an Englishman, a profound Scholar and a Roman Cardinal. A better appointment could not have been made, but it was in direct violation of the King's prerogative. The Pope and John both stood firm; the former threatening to put the kingdom under an Interdict, the latter swearing that if his envoys came for that purpose, he would pluck out their eyes and slit their noses, and so return them to the Pope.

On March 23, A.D. 1208, the Interdict was imposed. All religious services in the Churches were forbidden; the Monasteries were closed; the dead lay unburied, or were cast into ditches without the ministration of a Priest. Private Baptism for Infants and Sacraments for the dying were alone allowed. A curse seemed to rest on the whole kingdom.

After two years the Pope proceeded to excommunicate the King. John cared no more for the Excommunication than he did for the Interdict. At last the Pope threatened to depose him, and entrusted to Philip Augustus of France the execution of the sentence. Deposition in the eyes of John was a far more serious matter than the Interdict or Excommunication. Standing alone in the kingdom, finding himself opposed alike by the Clergy, the Barons, and the Laity of England, he came

to the most humiliating terms, not with Philip, but with the Pope, the author of all his misfortunes. He surrendered the Kingdom to Pandulf, the Pope's Legate, receiving it back as a Fief of the Pope, to whom he promised a yearly payment of one thousand marks. Shortly afterwards the Archbishop arrived in England; the King asked of him forgiveness for the past and promised amendment for the future, and the Archbishop granted him Absolution. This was done in July, and on October 3 the Interdict was removed from the Kingdom.

John, a man without religion; a scoffer of Priests and Sacraments; without a friend; hated and feared in every family throughout the land for his low debaucheries, clutched at the last straw, and threw himself on the protection of the Pope. Thenceforward he became the favourite son of the Pope; the Pope espoused the cause of a traitor and murderer, (for that he contrived the death of his nephew Arthur there is little doubt,) against the Archbishop and Clergy, the Barons and people of England.

In appointing Stephen Langton to the Primacy, Innocent little thought that he was raising up the very man who more than any one else would bridle the Popes' pretensions in England. Langton was not only a great Churchman, but a wise and patriotic Statesman, a strenuous upholder of the liberties of the Church and State. John had sworn to Langton, before he gave him absolution, to observe the laws of England. The old Saxon laws were embodied in the Charter of Henry I.^e; Langton having persuaded the Barons to act together for the good of the country, they determined to take their stand on this Charter, which they offered to the King as the basis of National action. Backed by the Papal Legate, John swore he would never consent to the Charter; and finding that the Barons were equally resolute, he even took the vows of a Crusader, against whom it was a sacrilege to make war. But the Clergy and Barons of England, who

* See p. 428.

stood together as one man, called themselves the *Army of God and of the Church*. Langton presented a list of their petitions to the King; "Why do you not demand my Kingdom also?" John asked, and he swore by God's teeth that he would never yield.

Yielding at length to necessity, John signed on June 15, A.D. 1215, at Runnymede, Magna Charta, trusting that his Suzerain the Pope would absolve him from the oath, which he never meant to keep.

The first thing that John did, after signing Magna Charta, was to send Pandulf to Rome with a request to the Pope to annul it. The Pope stigmatised it as "a base and unlawful composition," (*compositio vilis et turpis, verum etiam illicita*); "Do these Barons," he asked, "dare to transfer the Patrimony of the Church of Rome?" and he took upon himself to annul the Law of England. On August 14 he issued a Bull, declaring that England was a Fief of Rome, and when it was treated by the Barons with contempt, he ordered the Archbishop, whom he expected to find a pliant tool, to excommunicate them. Langton refused, and was suspended, and the suspension was confirmed in the Lateran Council, at which Langton was present, (A.D. 1215), nor, although it was afterwards removed, was Langton allowed to return to England during John's lifetime.

Innocent declared that the two principal objects of his life were the recovery of the Holy Land from the Saracens and the Reformation of the Church. At the beginning of his Pontificate he sanctioned the abortive Fourth Crusade, and towards the end he issued a Bull in favour of the Fifth, which was one of the principal objects he had in view in summoning the Lateran Council of 1215.

No more magnificent Council of the Church was ever held. It was attended by the representatives of both Emperors; by all the Patriarchs either in person or by proxy; by seventy Metropolitans; more than four hundred Bishops, and eight

hundred other Prelates ; all acknowledging the Pope of Rome as their Head, and assembled to receive from his lips the Law of Christendom. At that Council the distinctive features of Romanism were engrafted on the Theology of the Church ; first the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and then the necessity of people of both sexes confessing, at least once a year, their sins to the Priest, and receiving the Holy Eucharist at Easter.

Matthew Paris accuses Innocent of avarice ; yet, says Dean Milman, "his high and blameless, and in some respects wise and gentle character, seems to approach more nearly than any one of the long succession of Roman Popes to the ideal light of a supreme Pontiff."

The death of Innocent III. occurred on July 16, A.D. 1216, John of England dying on the following October 2 ; Stephen Langton died on July 19, A.D. 1221.

Langton by Magna Charta extorted from John the fundamental principles of English liberty ; and as the first clause in Henry's Charter had enacted, that "God's Holy Church should be free," so likewise the first clause of Magna Charta declared, that "the Church of England shall be free," and secured to the Church its rights, and the free election of its Bishops.

For a time there were not wanting Popes who maintained for the Papacy the high position at which Innocent had left it. The Popes who immediately followed him were more exorbitant in their demands, but only thereby endangered their cause, till the repulsive arrogance of Boniface VIII., at the end of the Thirteenth Century, undermined and shook the Papacy to its centre.

Honorius III. (1216—1227), the next Pope, was equally urgent in the cause of the Crusade. By him Frederic II. was crowned Emperor, A.D. 1220, when he renewed the vow by which he had bound himself, in his Coronation as King at Aix-la-Chapelle, to join the Crusade, and to protect the possessions of the Church.

Philip Augustus of France died A.D. 1223 ; in England, where there was a boy-king, Henry III., (whose sister Isabella, Frederic married), a general apathy as to the Crusade everywhere prevailed. Political exigencies also required the presence of Frederic at home, and prevented him fulfilling his vow. In vain the Pope charged him with evasion, and attributed to him the ill-success that attended the Crusade ; an imminent rupture between the two was only averted by the death of the Pope.

The next Pope, Gregory IX. (1227—1241), a man of vulgar and arrogant temper, whose whole Pontificate was taken up by quarrels with the Emperor, was equally urgent in the cause of the Crusade ; and excommunicated him for his lukewarmness.

Frederic was now able to fulfil his vow, and A.D. 1228 proceeded on the Crusade. Frederic's delay had been caused by an illness which attacked him when he was on the point of setting out for Palestine. The Pope was more angry than ever with this act of an excommunicated Emperor, and excommunicated him again for going. On his return, after having concluded with Saladin a truce favourable to the Christians, and recovered Jerusalem, he excommunicated him a third time for returning.

After a time a short-lived peace was (A.D. 1230) concluded between them, and Frederic received the Papal absolution. But quarrels soon again broke out, and (A.D. 1239) Gregory again declared the Emperor excommunicate, and deposed him. St. Louis IX. was at the time King of France (1226—1270), and to his brother, Robert, the Pope offered the Imperial Throne. No one can call in question the saintly character of Louis, who was afterwards (A.D. 1297) canonised by the Church of Rome, nor the strong sense of duty which actuated all his proceedings. Yet even such a devout son of the Church rebuked this flagrant act of injustice of the Pope ;—"What means this arrogant and daring Pope," he asks, "to disinherit a King, who has not only no superior, but no equal in Christen-

dôm, in whom there is more religion than in the Pope; who has fought valiantly for our Lord Jesus Christ both by sea and land? He has wickedly," he says, "supplanted him, though unconvicted, at the very time when he was engaged in the cause of God; and even if he had been convicted, no power but a General Council could depose him."

Louis, in his long reign, was brought to thoroughly understand the corruptions of the Papacy, and he set himself resolutely against the aggressive pretensions of the Popes. He himself stands high as a Legislator, and the laws passed in his reign complain of his Realm, which "he held from God alone," being impoverished by the rapacity of Rome. The Pragmatic Sanction, which was long, although probably wrongly attributed to him, and which claimed for the Nation the canonical appointment of its Bishoprics, if not his, at any rate embodies his principles.

Notwithstanding the protest of the French King, the quarrels between Frederic and the Pope continued, and were only ended by the death of the latter, who died, worn out by disasters, which his own violence had brought upon him.

Celestine IV., the successor of Gregory, died before his Consecration, and eighteen days after his election. After a considerable delay, the Cardinals elected Innocent IV. (1243—1254), who put forth pretensions as high, and even higher, than any of his predecessors. Under him the struggle with the Emperor continued, and (A.D. 1244) the Pope, not thinking himself safe in any part of Italy, found an asylum, which was refused him in England, at Lyons. There he convened in the following year a Council, with the object of considering the differences between the Pope and Emperor, and between the Eastern and Western Churches, and the prevalence of Heresy in the Church. Frederic, who being under the ban of excommunication, did not himself attend it, was represented by his envoy. The Pope, the Latin Emperor of Constantinople, and the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch were present.

To this Council envoys from England represented, but in vain, the grievances which their Church suffered through the exactions of Rome.

The Pope (although not with the approbation of the Council), deposed the Emperor, and declared the Imperial Throne vacant. The Emperor declared that he was subject to God alone, and that neither Pope nor Council should deprive him of his Throne. In vain the Pope tried to stir up an insurrection against him. The fidelity of his subjects was so unshaken, and Frederic's authority so universally accepted in Germany, that no eligible candidate could be found willing to supersede him. The Emperor still desired peace, but the relentless enmity of the Pope pursued him to the last; a violent dysentery ended his life on December 13, A.D. 1250. The great Emperor, the *Wonder of the World*, as he was called, persecuted by four Popes one after another, Innocent III., Honorius III., Gregory IX., and Innocent IV., dying, after having been reconciled to the Church by the Bishop of Palermo, under the conviction that the Pope had instigated his physician to poison him.

His son, Conrad IV. (1250—1254), succeeded him, but was never crowned Emperor. The Pope hastened back to Rome from Lyons; the struggle between Pope and Emperor was renewed with redoubled vigour, only to be ended by the death of Conrad in May, A.D. 1254, to be followed by that of the Pope in December of the same year.

Alexander IV. (1254—1261) was the next Pope. In his Pontificate, at a time when Italy was agitated by the fatal dissensions of the Guelphs and Ghibellines, and the Pope was engaged in conflict with the Hohenstaufens, the Latin Empire in the East came to an end, and (A.D. 1261) Constantinople was retaken for the Greeks by the Eastern Emperor, Michael Palæologus (1261—1281)^f.

Alexander was succeeded by Urban IV. (1261—1264), a

^f For the Crusades, see next Chapter.

Frenchman, who had been Patriarch of Jerusalem under the Latin Empire, and whose Pontificate was marked by the institution of the Festival of Corpus Christi.

Next to him came another Frenchman, Clement IV. (1265—1268). The Emperor, Michael Palæologus, made an attempt at reconciling the Eastern and Western Churches; but his advances were met by Clement with the arrogance which had now become characteristic of the Papal See. The Pope was unwilling to make any relaxation; a Reunion could only be effected by the Easterns conceding all the points of dispute, and accepting the Supremacy of the Pope.

In the Pontificate of Clement the noble race of the Hohenstaufens came to an end. The Pope conferred the Kingdom of Sicily upon Charles of Anjou, brother of St. Louis, King of France. Manfred had been King of Sicily since 1256, but he was the son of the Emperor Frederic, and therefore the object of hatred to the Popes. The young Conradin, grandson of the Emperor Frederic, entering Naples in the hope of recovering his lawful dominions, though joyfully welcomed by his own subjects as their deliverer, was met by the excommunication of the Pope, and being defeated in battle, on August 23, A.D. 1268, by Charles, miserably died on the scaffold, if not by the suggestion, yet with the approval of the Pope, at the hands of the executioner. Thus died the last of the Hohenstaufens, a hero that might have excited the pity of any other than a Pope; the long contest between the Popes and the Hohenstaufens was ended, and the Popes had conquered the greatest power of the world.

After the death of Conrad, A.D. 1254, there was an interregnum till the year 1273, when the Germans elected Rudolph, Count of Hapsburg, the founder of the House of Hapsburg or Austria, as their King. Rudolph invested his son Albert I. with the Duchy of Austria, which he had won in battle; and thus Albert became first King (for neither he nor his father Rudolph were ever crowned as Emperors) of Austria, and his posterity took

•

their title from Austria rather than from Hapsburg, as being the more illustrious principality of the two.

After the death of Clement, the Papacy, owing to dissensions amongst the Cardinals, was vacant for three years ; when Theobald, Archdeacon of Liége, who was summoned from Acre, whither he had gone on the Crusade, was elected Pope as Gregory X. (1271—1275). He left the East with the pious ejaculation of the Psalmist : “ If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning.”

The new Pope, who was a man of gentler and more charitable temper than many of his predecessors, did not interest himself in war, and excommunication of Emperors, but in the peaceful object of a Crusade, which, as having been himself an eye-witness of the calamities of the Christians in the East, he was desirous to promote, and which he also thought might be the means of reconciling the Eastern and Western Churches. Accordingly he (A.D. 1274) summoned the Second Council of Lyons, which the Roman Church designates a General Council, with the threefold object of effecting the reconciliation between the Churches, promoting a Crusade, and the reformation of the Church. The Pope himself presided : the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch, more than five-hundred Bishops, seventy Abbots, and a large number of lesser Dignitaries, attended, the Emperor Palæologus sending his deputies. It was agreed that the differences between the two Churches were verbal rather than real ; the deputies of the Eastern Emperor and the principal Greek Bishops consented to recognise the Supremacy of the Pope, to allow the Roman usages, and accept the Latin Creed. At the Mass at which the Pope was Celebrant, and the Gospel was sung both in Latin and Greek, the Greek Prelates thrice repeated the words, “ Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son ; ” and in the fourth session the reconciliation between the Churches was effected.

One of the Canons of the Council established the Rule as to the Election of the Popes, which, although exceedingly unpopular at the time with the Cardinals, has, with a short intermission and slight modifications, continued to the present day. To prevent a recurrence of what had happened on the death of Clement, and a vacancy of the Papacy for any length of time, it was enacted that on the death of a Pope, the Cardinals, after waiting ten days for the arrival of absentees, should be shut up in *conclave*, all living in the same room, without means of communication with the outer world, and receiving their food through a window which was left open for the purpose, till such time as two-thirds of the number were agreed as to a successor.

A new Crusade also was decreed, and Rudolph of Hapsburg, who had two years before been elected to the throne, pledged himself to join it.

Gregory having thus effected a reconciliation between the Eastern and Western Churches, and enlisted the sympathy of Christendom in a Crusade, having by peaceful means effected greater credit for the Papacy than his warlike predecessors, died in January, A.D. 1275.

His peaceful victory, however, was of short duration. The Crusading enthusiasm had died out. The reconciliation between East and West was rudely interrupted, and so bitter was the feeling of his Eastern subjects against Palæologus, when he tried to enforce conformity on the Greek Clergy, that his throne was imperilled. One of the first acts of his son and successor, Andronicus II. (1282—1331) was to annul the agreement. The Patriarch, a man of great ability whom Palæologus had appointed, was deposed. The memory of the late Emperor was execrated by his subjects, and treated with contempt by his son. Thus the ill-feeling between the two Churches was intensified.

Innocent V. was Pope for only five months; his successor, Hadrian V., for less than one month; John XXI. for eight

months (1276—1277). Four Popes then followed in quick succession. Nicolas III. (1277—1280), a member of the Orsini family, commenced the structure of the Vatican Palace. Martin IV. (1281—1285), who took his title from St. Martin of Tours, was a Frenchman; and during his Pontificate, the Massacre, known as that of the Sicilian Vespers, occurred, A.D. 1282. It arose out of an insult offered at Palermo by a French soldier to a high-born and beautiful Sicilian Lady, at the time when the inhabitants were engaged at Vespers. All French people found near the spot were, in revenge, without respect of sex or age, massacred; the Monasteries were destroyed, and the Monks, the allies of the French, murdered; the massacre extending throughout the length and breadth of Sicily, till no Frenchman was left alive. Martin adopted every means in his power to avenge the slaughter of his countrymen, but his intentions were frustrated by his death at Perugia, A.D. 1285.

Honorius IV. (1285—1287) the next Pope, was an old man so crippled with gout as to unfit him for the performance of his public functions.

Nicolas IV. (1288—1292) succeeded. Acre, the last hold of the Christians in the Holy Land, having fallen (A.D. 1291) into the hands of the Infidels, Nicolas in vain endeavoured to stimulate the Western Church to a Crusade. The day for Crusades was ended, the death of the Pope was supposed to be hurried on by the news of the final expulsion of the Christians from Palestine.

The Papacy having been kept vacant for two years and three months after the death of Nicolas, a wide-spread astonishment was felt at the intelligence that the College of Cardinals, which at that time numbered only twelve, moved probably by mutual jealousy, had elected a poor, aged hermit, aged seventy-two, named Peter of Murrone. Peter, a man of eminent sanctity and austerity of life, reluctantly accepted the dignity, which was forced on him, for which, through his ignorance of matters of

the world, he was wholly unsuited, and took the title of Celestine V.

But he longed for a return to his hermit life, and into this he was tricked by an intriguing Cardinal, Benedict Gaetani. In vain the other Cardinals remonstrated with him ; a strong sense of duty, a feeling that his present position imperilled both his own soul and the souls of others, prevailed over every other consideration ; so the old man laid aside his Pontifical robes to return, as he fondly hoped, to his former life. He was, however, by the treachery of Gaetani, conveyed in strict custody to a castle in the Campagna, where, although he did not die, as was thought at the time, from actual violence, yet he was consigned to so small a cell that the Altar-steps on which he stood whilst celebrating Mass, served as his pillow at night. Such intentional cruelty, added to the deprivation of the mere necessities of life, hastened his end.

Benedict Gaetani, an avaricious and grasping man, whose mind was filled with one idea, the exaltation of the Papacy, succeeded him under the title of Boniface VIII. (1294—1303). Boniface failed to perceive the altered circumstances of the times ; a compact monarchy in France under Philip the Fair (1285—1314), a hard and avaricious man, who troubled himself little about the censures of the Church, and was ready to take up the quarrel with the Papacy, which the German Emperors had dropped ; in England, no longer a weak King, like John, but the powerful Edward I. (1272—1307), with a constitutional Parliament and Convocation ; with Clergy and people thirsting for religious and civil liberty, and impatient under Papal exactions. Yet Boniface put forth the same arbitrary pretensions as the most arrogant of his predecessors ; the *two swords* of the Gospel^s were now interpreted as symbolical of the Spiritual and Temporal Power of the Popes.

Neither Edward nor Philip, in their want of money, were

^s St. Luke xxii. 38.

scrupulous as to the means of getting it. Here were two instances where the Spiritual Head of Western Christendom might have exercised a judicious, if temperate, mediation, and even an overstrained sense of duty would have merited respect and sympathy. But Benedict, like so many of his predecessors, even if he did the right thing, did it in the wrong way; and it was manifest that his high-handed interference proceeded, not from a sense of duty, but from the lust of power; and it proved fatal not only to him but also to the Papacy.

Boniface was during his Pontificate engaged in conflict with two Potentates, equally determined to maintain their own authority, as he was to assert his. For the sake of perspicuity, we will take first his quarrel with England, the history of which we will resume from the time when King John sold England to the Pope.

Notwithstanding this act of John, England, although it had to fight its battles with the Popes under a disadvantage, never lost its independence, and neither Church nor State ever bowed to, nor recognised, the Supremacy of Rome.

John, though a traitor, was a very clever one, and understood how the Pope might be of service to him; but the intrusion of the Papacy into England against the united voice of the Clergy, the Barons, and the people, was a fatal blunder on the part of the Pope. He thereby inaugurated the resistance to Rome, which, almost without intermission, has characterised the history of the Church of England from that time to the present day. Stephen Langton entered a protest in writing against John's act; and the English Parliament afterwards complained that the Pope had taken an unfair advantage at the time when the King of England was detested and forsaken by his subjects.

Henry III. (1216—1272), the son and successor of John, a boy of nine years of age at his accession, had been entrusted by his father to the guardianship of Honorius III., the successor of Innocent in the See of Rome. Henry grew up, professedly

a pious man, but one in whose word no one could trust ; he had therefore the same reason as his father for courting the alliance of the Pope, who, he believed, would be willing to free him from its obligation.

Stephen Langton, the patriotic Archbishop of Canterbury, died, as already said, on July 9, A.D. 1228. The worst feature in his character was the severity with which he enforced the Roman practice of Celibacy on the Clergy. But it must be borne in mind that Langton had been educated in the bosom of the Church of Rome, in which he had held important offices, as a Cardinal, and Chancellor of the University of Paris. Lanfranc and Anselm, like Dunstan before them, had in vain attempted to engraft Clerical Celibacy on the Church of England. But in a Synod held in June, A.D. 1222, at Osney, near Oxford, the wives of the Clergy were stigmatised as *concubines*, and were forbidden the Churches ; the Clergy who refused to put away their wives were to be deprived and excommunicated, and on their deaths to be denied Christian burial.

The reign of Henry III. covers more than half of the Thirteenth Century. That century was a golden era of English Churchmanship ; the era of Stephen Langton, of Edmund Rich, Archbishop of Canterbury, (1234—1240, St. Edmund of Abingdon, as he was called after his native town,) of Grosse-teste, Bishop of Lincoln, of the two Cantilupes, Walter, Bishop of Worcester, and his nephew Thomas Cantilupe, Bishop of Hereford. It was also the century in which our Church Convocations and National Parliaments gradually took shape.

As no country was so rich as England, no country suffered equally from Papal extortion. Nor were the Popes scrupulous in the means which they adopted in enforcing their demands for money. They sent over their Legates, with power over Archbishops and Bishops, to impose taxes and to see that

they were paid ; and they appointed their own Bankers or money-lenders called Caursines, to collect the taxes.

The system of Papal exactions was inaugurated A.D. 1226, by a demand of Pope Honorius for two Prebends in every Cathedral and Collegiate Church, and with a similar demand upon the monasteries. The plea was somewhat original. The Roman See was accused of avarice ; the accusation, the Pope admitted, was true, and avarice was the root of all evil ; to obviate such a scandal for the future, her sons were called upon to alleviate her wants. In a Council held at Westminster the demand was dismissed with laughter.

Pope Gregory IX., the Pope who had persecuted the Emperor Frederic, and brought upon himself a reprimand for avarice from St. Louis of France, succeeded, by means of a threat of Excommunication, in obtaining from England a grant of money, to provide which the Bishops were compelled to sell or pawn the Church-plate.

In 1229 an attempt of the same Pope to interfere with English Patronage was met with such violent opposition that the lives of the Romanists in England were in danger. The Pope claimed the right of setting aside the Patronage of the Bishops and lay Patrons, and of appointing Italians, on the Scriptural ground that " God is no Respector of persons." The Pope wrote to the King a letter of complaint of the treatment which his emissaries had suffered ; one had been torn in pieces, another left half-dead ; their credentials torn up ; the Pope's Bull trodden under foot. So maltreated, he said, were the Italian clergy, that it seemed as if the age of the Persecutions had returned, and that Nero was brought back to life. It does not seem to have occurred to him that the arrogance of the Pope of Rome was a contrast to the humility of SS. Peter and Paul, whom Nero persecuted.

The Barons of England wrote to the Pope that they felt it their duty to awaken their Lord, who " was now sleeping in St. Peter's vessel," and to warn him that " the children might be provoked

against their Father." The Pope found it the part of discretion to yield.

In 1240 the Legate of the same Pope forbade the King to confer any Church Benefice on English Clergy until three hundred Roman Clergy were provided for. Edmund Rich, who was at the time Archbishop of Canterbury, expostulated with the Pope and the King on the robbery of the Church's liberties and possessions; his life, Matthew Paris says, became in consequence intolerable, Pope and King being in league against him. Leaving England, he sought a refuge on the Continent, but died in the same year, and was shortly afterwards canonised by another Pope, Innocent IV. On his death, Henry III. appointed as Archbishop, Boniface of Savoy (1245—1270), a violent and worldly-minded, as well as a thoroughly illiterate, man, the uncle of his wife, Eleanor of Provence, a woman who thoroughly despised England and the English people, and through the advancement of her own relatives tried to build up a foreign party in the Kingdom.

Pope Innocent IV., who, although he canonised St. Edmund Rich, was no less avaricious than Gregory, sent to England "another harpy," one Martin; but the Barons kindly warned him that unless he left the kingdom immediately "he would be cut in pieces." The King, who now for a time sided with the Barons, told the Legate he might go to a place which need not here be named. So he made his way out of England "the best way he could."

In 1245 a deputation of Barons from England laid before the Council assembled at Lyons, where Pope Innocent was in exile, a statement of the National grievances and the Papal extortions. They complained that English Benefices were held by foreigners who could not speak the English language; and that Italians drew annually from England a sum of money larger than the whole revenue of the Crown.

In 1246 the King, who was still on the patriotic side, laid

before a Parliament in London a list of the National grievances; Kings, Bishops, and Barons all took the same view; different articles set forth their complaints, that the Papal extortions were against the customs of the land; that Italians were appointed to English Bishoprics, and that Englishmen were cited out of the English Courts to appear at Rome. The Barons again warned the Pope that unless these and other grievances were removed, the consequences might be fatal to him.

The foremost Prelate of the time was Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, a thorough Catholic, and a man desirous of being a firm supporter of the Pope. From this uncompromising Prelate, Pope Innocent IV. was rash enough to demand (A.D. 1247) six thousand marks as the portion of the Diocese of Lincoln towards the Papal demands in England. In 1253 the same Pope appointed by *Provision* his nephew Frederic de Livagna, a boy not as yet in Holy Orders, to a Canonry in Lincoln Cathedral. Grosseteste, from being the friend, was thus turned into the Pope's opponent. He refused the money extortion, and told the Pope that he had impoverished the Church of England more than all his predecessors put together. The Papal nominee he rejected, and addressed at the same time a strong letter of expostulation to Innocent.

Next to the sin of Lucifer and of Antichrist, he said, no sin is so opposed to the teaching of Christ and His Apostles, as to destroy men's souls, by depriving them of their Pastoral guides. The Holy Apostolic See, which received its authority for edification and not for destruction, could never countenance such a horrible prevarication, which would be tantamount to the abandonment of its authority; such persons might be said to sit in a chair of pestilence with the Devil and Antichrist. No one in communion with the Church could obey such commands.

The Pope asked "What the old dotting man was, who has outlived his brains and manners, and has presumed to censure our conduct?" he speaks of him as such a wretch that must be

punished in a manner to amaze the world. In vain the Cardinals warned the irate Pope that Grosseteste was a most holy Prelate and a great Philosopher, and "has advanced nothing but the truth." The Pope excommunicated the Bishop, and under that sentence he died on October 10, A.D. 1253.

We will mention one other English Prelate who suffered about this time for his opposition to Papal tyranny, Sewall, Archbishop of York (1256—1258). When Alexander IV. appointed Giordano to the Deanery, and other Italians to Benefices, in York, Sewall, who refused to institute them, wrote a letter of remonstrance to the Pope, that our Saviour had commissioned St. Peter to feed His sheep, not to *flay* and *eat* them. The Pope excommunicated him also, and the Archbishop died of a broken heart, appealing to Heaven against the Pope's injustice.

By *Expectatives*, *Mandates*, and *Provisions* (the last of which came into vogue under the English Pope, Hadrian IV.), the Popes entirely usurped the Patronage of the Church, and numerous livings were frequently bestowed on the same Italian, who never came near England and could not speak a word of English. So that the Papal system had by this time become hateful alike to Clergy and Laity; to the latter because these absent Foreigners drained the Country of its wealth; to the former because they usurped the Benefices which rightfully belonged to them.

The Papal usurpation had now reached a claim which no section of the people would tolerate. No one could believe the King, for no sooner did he promise, than the Pope absolved him from keeping his promise. The misgovernment of Henry was undoing all that Stephen Langton and the Great Charter had done, and the Barons finding that ordinary measures and peaceful means were unavailing, prepared for war, and found a leader in Simon de Montfort.

The Pope sided with the King against the Church and the

National party, and at the request of Henry sent his Legate over to England. Archbishop Boniface however informed him that, if he set foot in England, he would be torn in pieces ; so he wisely came no further than Boulogne. On May 13, A.D. 1264, the King's army having been defeated at the battle of Lewes, and he and his son Edward taken prisoners, Simon became for a time, in all but name, King of England. On January 20, A.D. 1265, a Parliament, containing all the essentials of our modern Parliaments met at Westminster. But dissensions which now arose amongst the Barons were fatal to the National Party ; and on August 4, their army was defeated by the young Prince Edward, and Simon de Montfort and his son were killed.

On the death of Henry, A.D. 1272, his son Edward I. succeeded to the throne of England. England had now a powerful and able King. The misgovernment of his father and grandfather, and the lessons of the oppression of the Popes and the rebellion of the Barons which he had learnt from Simon de Montfort, who, although his opponent in battle, was his uncle and Godfather, were not lost on him. He had learnt that he must continue the work of Stephen Langton, and Edmund Rich, and Grosseteste, and de Montfort, and develop the principle of Magna Charta.

The Clergy of the two Provinces, Canterbury and York, had been long accustomed to meet in their Parliaments, or Convocations, to arrange matters of the Church, and to tax themselves. In 1295 Simon de Montfort's Parliament of 1265 was reproduced in the manner of our present Parliaments, the Three Estates, Clergy, Nobles, and Commons, being called together to transact the business of the Realm. From this completed organisation of Parliamentary government, commences that series of Anti-papal Legislation which characterises the History of the Church and Parliament of England. John having once let the Pope into England, it was difficult to get him out again. But Parliament passed Acts against his pretended Supremacy ; by Church and State alike, the independence of the Church of Eng-

land was again and again asserted. The interests of the Kings, who were often on the side of the Popes, and the Wars of the Roses, postponed the consummation; but the Papal Supremacy was never recognised by Law, and its expulsion was only a matter of time.

In September, A.D. 1294, Edward summoned the Clergy of both Provinces to meet him at Westminster, where he demanded of them one half of the revenues of the Church as a supply towards the war which he had entered upon with the French. So alarmed were the Clergy at the demand, that the Dean of St. Paul's is said to have expired from fright in the King's presence. The demand, however, was conceded, the King thus receiving no less a sum than £100,000.

Pope Boniface issued on February 24, A.D. 1296, the famous Bull, known from its first two words, as *Clericis Laicos*, which forbade the Clergy to surrender any portion of their Revenues without the Pope's sanction. But as the Clergy had their own Convocation the King would not allow the Pope's interference in the matter of their taxation, and demanded from them, in the same year, another subsidy. Robert Winchelsea, the Archbishop of Canterbury (1294—1313), backed by the Papal Bull, put himself in open antagonism to the King, and the Clergy, following his example, refused compliance with the King's demand on the ground that it was forbidden by the Pope. Whereupon the King placed them out of the protection of the law; their goods, even to the last horse in the Archbishop's stables, were forfeited to the King, and they were thus starved into submission, the Archbishop alone remaining firm and adhering to the Bull.

Two Acts of Parliament only, with regard to Papal action, need here be mentioned. On June 27, A.D. 1299, Pope Boniface issued a Bull, claiming jurisdiction over Scotland, on the ground that it always had been from the earliest times a Fief of Rome. The King laid the Bull, on January 20, A.D. 1301, before the Parliament which assembled that year at Lincoln. The Parlia-

ment met the claim of the Pope with a distinct denial. It also addressed a letter to the Pope, declaring that "our Sovereign the King is by no means obliged to own the Jurisdiction of your Court, or to submit to your Holiness' censure, *with regard to any Temporal matter whatever.*"

In 1307, the last year of King Edward I.'s life, a Petition was presented by the Earls and Barons to the Parliament which met in January at Carlisle, complaining of the exactions made under the Pope's authority, Clement V. being the delinquent Pope. The first Article complained of the *Provisions* to the best Church Preferments made for Italians and other non-resident foreigners. The third was directed against the Pope's claim for *First-fruits* of Benefices, "a thing never heard of before." The fourth complained of the demand for Peter-pence, which trebled the original grant. A declaration was drawn up with the concurrence of King, Lords, and Commons, that such grievances and extortions could no longer be permitted. The Clergy, however, were too much afraid of excommunication to sign, and the King had his reasons for not wishing to quarrel with the Pope; so legislation on the matter was carried no further.

We shall have to return later on to further Anti-papal Legislation in England^h.

Pope Boniface was still more unfortunate in his dealings with France than he was in England, and the Gallican Clergy supported the King in his conflict with the Pope.

Philip the Fair, who, like Edward of England, wanted money for the war, imposed a taxation, from which they had previously enjoyed an immunity, upon the Clergy. He set the Bull *Clericis Laicos* at defiance, and replied to it by depriving the Pope of the annual income which he had been in the habit of receiving from the French Clergy. The Pope thereupon issued the Bull *Ineffabilis*, with the view of softening down and

^h See Chap. XV.

explaining the former Bull, but without deflecting the King from his purpose.

In 1300 the Jubilee was held at Rome, and the Pope, who had lately observed a more quiescent attitude, was so elated with its success, that he thought it a favourable opportunity for renewing his pretensions. He sent to the Court of Philip, a Legate, an unruly and insolent man, who, he had reason to know, was particularly objectionable to the King. The Bishop addressed him in arrogant and offensive language, whereupon Philip committed him to prison. This called forth from the Pope the Bull *Ausculta Fili*, in which he declared that the Pope had power "to pluck down, destroy, and rebuild;" he summoned the Gallican Bishops to meet him in Rome to deliberate on the disorders of the State; and declared that Philip held the Kingdom of France as a Fief of Rome. The Bull was publicly burnt, and the King forbade the Clergy to attend the Council at Rome; and on April 10, A.D. 1302, the Estates General, the Nobles, the Clergy, and the Commons, bound themselves to observe the liberties of the Kingdom, and drew up a remonstrance to the Pope and Cardinals.

In the same year the Pope issued the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, which declared that "it is altogether necessary to salvation that every human creature should be subject to the Roman Pontiff," and in April, 1303, a sentence of Excommunication was published against the King of France.

In the early years of his Pontificate, Boniface had deeply offended the Colonnas, one of the most powerful families of Rome, who had advocated the cause of Pope Celestine. Boniface, who had before been a Ghibelline, went over to the Guelphs, the hereditary enemies of the Colonnas, whom he denounced as enemies of the Church, excommunicating two Cardinals and their family.

The Pope had retired to his native place, Anagni, whence he determined to issue a sentence of deposition against Philip.

On September 7 (the day preceding that on which the Bull was to be fulminated), a party of the Colonnas who were engaged in the service of Philip, set fire to a Church which adjoined the Pope's Palace. A violent scene occurred, in which a brutal Colonna struck the aged Pope on the face with his gauntlet. Boniface contrived to escape to Rome, where he found an asylum in the family of the Orsini, the enemies of the Colonnas. But the recent outrage was more than an old man, eighty-six years of age, could bear; his mind gave way, so that it was necessary to place him under restraint; and on October 11, 1303, he was found dead in his bed, his death being attributed by some to grief, by others to poison, and even to his own hand. The saying, which was attributed to his predecessor, seemed to be fulfilled; "he entered like a fox, reigned like a lion, and died like a dog."

On the death of Boniface, the Papacy was in a critical position. Benedict XI. (1303—1304), the next Pope, at once set himself to repair the breach which his predecessor had effected between France and the Papacy, and in order to conciliate Philip, annulled several of his acts, and considerably modified the Bull *Clericis Laicos*. He refused, however, to advance as far as the King of France wished, or publicly to condemn Boniface; he died suddenly, and it was believed by poison, the guilt being imputed by many to Philip's officers.

After his short and uneventful Pontificate, the Papacy, owing to a disagreement amongst the Cardinals, some of whom wished to elect an Italian, others a French Pope, was vacant for nearly a whole year. Eventually, through the influence of Philip, a Frenchman, the Bishop of Bordeaux the first in the line of French Popes, was elected under the title of Clement V. (1305—1314).

CHAPTER XIV.

THE CRUSADES—THE FRIARS—THE SCHOOLMEN.

JERUSALEM under the Turks—They persecute the Christian Pilgrims—Peter the Hermit—Pope Urban II.—Council of Piacenza—Of Clermont—First Crusade determined on—Expeditions under Peter and Walter the Penniless—Its miserable end—The Crusade entrusted to Godfrey de Bouillon—The Crusaders take Jerusalem—Pope Paschal II. appoints a Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem—Godfrey becomes Baron of the Holy Sepulchre—Succeeded in the Kingdom of Jerusalem by his brother Baldwin—Second Crusade—Its failure—Jerusalem taken by Saladin—Third Crusade under the Emperor Barbarossa—Richard Cœur de Lion—Barbarossa drowned—Its unsuccessful result—The Fourth Crusade undertaken by the French and Venetians—Sacrilège and plunder by the Crusaders at Constantinople—Result of the Crusade—A Latin Kingdom and Latin Patriarch set up—The Children's Crusade—The Fifth Crusade—The Emperor Frederic II.—The Sixth Crusade—Palestine recovered—It falls again under the Tartars—The Seventh and Eighth Crusades under St. Louis of France—His death—Edward I. of England as a Crusader—Result of the Crusades—Church Architecture—The Friars—SS. Dominic and Francis—Degeneracy of the Friars—Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh—Contests between the Dominicans and Franciscans—And of the Franciscans amongst themselves—Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception—Object of the Schoolmen—The Philosophy of Aristotle—Nominalists and Realists—Wrong principles of the Schoolmen—The *Book of Sentences*—The *Decretum* of Gratian—Thomas Aquinas—Duns Scotus—Albert the Great—Bonaventura—Alexander of Hales—Ockham—Roger Bacon—The Schoolmen favourers of Roman Doctrine.

THE Papacy had, after difficulties which seemed at one time to imperil its existence, reached its climax in the Thirteenth Century. But there were all along many elements at work, forming parts of an elaborate machinery, all converging to the aggrandisement of the Popes.

Not least amongst these were the Crusades, or Holy Wars, undertaken, as their name implies, in defence of the Cross, to rescue the Holy Land, and especially the Tomb of our Saviour, from the hands of the Infidels.

Jerusalem had, as we have seen, fallen (A.D. 637) under the arms of the Saracens, and was for four hundred and forty-two years subject to the Caliphs of Bagdad, till (A.D. 1079) it came under the Rule of the Turkish Sultans, who accepted all that was bad, and rejected all that was good, in the Mahommedan faith. Pilgrims from the West had been allowed under the Saracens to pass unmolested to Jerusalem, in order to visit the scenes of our Saviour's Life and Death; food and accommodation were afforded them on the journey, and a comfortable hospice greeted them on its conclusion. The Pilgrimage was regarded as a meritorious act, accompanied with the remission of sins; if the Pilgrims returned home in safety, they were regarded as superior and privileged persons; if death befell them on the road, they were ensured a glorious eternity.

But under the Turks a system of persecution set in, and the Pilgrims, amongst whom was a large proportion of Frenchmen, returned to Europe with pitiful accounts of the robberies and cruel treatment to which they had been subjected. A cry of indignation, which rung through Western Christendom, stimulated a desire of vengeance; the Pilgrimage of earnest Christians to Jerusalem must not be abandoned, but it must thenceforward be undertaken under the protection and blessing of the Church; and this could only be effected through the successor of St. Peter.

The idea of a Crusade, to deliver Jerusalem from the hands of the Infidels, presented itself to the mind of Gerbert (Pope Sylvester II.), who in a letter called upon the soldiers of Christ to deliver it from the burdens under which it was groaning from the Infidel; but how far he advanced in the matter we have no means of judging. The idea had also been contemplated by Pope Gregory VII., but it was so obviously a scheme for his own aggrandisement, and for subjecting the Eastern Emperor and Patriarch of Constantinople to the See of Rome, that it came to nothing; but from that time the idea had never been

laid aside. A new dynasty having lately arisen in the Eastern Empire, under Alexios Comnenos, the Greek Emperor earnestly solicited Pope Urban II. to enlist the sympathy and aid of the Western Princes against the Infidels. Peter the Hermit, a native of Amiens, who, when on a recent pilgrimage to Jerusalem, had been an eye-witness of the sufferings of the Christians, consulted the Patriarch Simeon as to a course to be adopted for their relief. Simeon told him that from the Greeks, although they were near at hand, no aid could be expected, for that they had difficulty enough on their hands in protecting their own Emperor. Returning to Europe with the Benediction of the Patriarch, and with letters imploring aid from the Western Christians, Peter sought out the Pope and represented to him the miserable condition of Jerusalem and the persecution of the Christians.

He soon enlisted the sympathy of Urban, with whose blessing he was sent forth to make the cause known, and to stir up the people for the great work of God, and the benefit of their own souls. Peter, a man of good family, of small and mean appearance, but with a sharp eye and piercing eloquence; dressed in a coarse garment, with bare and naked feet; and carrying before him a weighty Crucifix, having first traversed the whole of Italy, then crossed the Alps. Preaching in the pulpits, in the streets and market-places, in the palaces of the rich and the cottages of the poor, he exhorted everywhere the people to the liberation of the Holy Land; he told them that when once they took the vow and became soldiers of the Cross, no former sin was too heinous to be forgiven, and that if they fell in battle their salvation was certain. He thus created a universal enthusiasm; multitudes crowded around him to touch his garments, and even collected the hairs which fell from his mule, as precious relics.

In 1095 Urban held a Council at Piacenza, which was attended by envoys from the Emperor Alexios, about four thousand Clergy and thirty thousand Laymen, and there, although no

definite plan was agreed upon, the cause of the Crusade was initiated. From Italy he crossed the Alps into France, of which country he was a native, and in November of the same year held a Council at Clermont in Auvergne. At the Council there were present, besides the Cardinals who had accompanied him from Italy, thirteen Archbishops, two hundred and twenty-five Bishops, and four hundred mitred Abbots, whilst huts were erected in the open country for the multitude of the laity who could not find accommodation in the town.

After several disciplinary Canons had been passed, one of which enacted that the Holy Eucharist should be received by the Laity in Both Kinds, Urban addressed the multitude, already favourably disposed to the cause through the preaching of the Hermit, inviting them to take part in the Crusade. The Saviour would be their Leader; the Penances due for their sins would be remitted, and Absolution granted; a red Cross on their breasts and shoulders would be the emblem of their salvation, and the pledge of their engagement; suffering they would have to endure, but death would be a blessed martyrdom; and during their absence their property would be under the protection of the Church.

At the close of the speech a loud and simultaneous shout, *God Wills it*, greeted him on all sides. The religious enthusiasm spread throughout Europe; and the Feast of Assumption, August 15, in the following year, was appointed for the departure of the Crusade.

Thus a new mode of Salvation, in which people thoroughly believed, and of which the Pope was the author, was devised. The Pope was placed on a higher pedestal than all the Potentates and Kings of the earth; he had the direction of the armies of Christendom; he had a pretext for interfering with every Government, and for sending his Legates into every country to collect money for the holy war; he could impose the Crusade for their souls' health on Emperors and Kings, and compel them

to take the vow of a Crusader; if they were good Christians, they would willingly take the Cross in defence of the Holy Sepulchre; if they were not good Christians, it would be his duty to visit them with chastisement.

Early in the spring of the following year, too eager to wait for the appointed day, two immense expeditions, consisting of people of both sexes, and all ages, drawn from the most decrepid and disreputable refuse of the community, destitute of money and with no proper commissariat; no idea where, or how far away, Jerusalem was, left for what must be, except by the intervention of some miracle, certain death, under Peter the Hermit and Walter the Penniless. The enthusiastic Peter was as rash as he was ignorant. Walter, a valiant though needy soldier, had points which fitted him for an able commander, and was deserving of a better fate. Hunger soon led the vast army to plunder, and when the restraint of religion was once removed, all order and decency was discarded, and vices of the deepest dye were the inevitable result. The Jews, the enemies of the Cross, of which they were the avowed defenders, underwent a cruel persecution at their hands. Suffice it to say that 300,000 of the miserable horde are reported to have perished, before a single city was rescued from the Saracens, or the main body of the Crusaders had entered on their task.

The regular army started on the appointed day under the command-in-chief of Godfrey de Bouillon, Robert, the eldest son of William the Conqueror, being one of the Leaders. Adhemar, Bishop of Puy, represented the Pope as his Legate. Nice, the capital of Bithynia, fell under their arms, A.D. 1097; and in the following year Edessa and Antioch. At the latter place Adhemar fell a victim to the plague. In May, 1099, the Crusaders set out from Antioch, and after innumerable lives had been sacrificed, and much suffering endured from the heat, and hunger and thirst, (for the enemy had cut off the supplies of water,) Jerusalem was taken on July 15. The capture was, it

is said, effected on Friday, at three o'clock in the afternoon, the hour of the Saviour's death upon the Cross.

Pope Urban was now dead, and his successor, Paschal II., appointed a Latin Patriarch at Jerusalem, and Latin Clergy in the place of Greeks; Godfrey was invested in the Kingdom of Jerusalem by the new Patriarch, refusing, however, to wear a golden crown where the Saviour had worn a Crown of thorns, and contenting himself with the title of Baron of the Holy Sepulchre. Godfrey died within twelve months, and was succeeded in the Kingdom of Jerusalem by his brother Baldwin (1100—1118). The Latin Kingdom contained only the city of Jerusalem and the neighbouring towns, and weakly from the first, continued for about eighty years, when it was destroyed by Saladin. Baldwin's relative, Baldwin II. (1118—1131) succeeded him. The next King was Fulk of Anjou (1131—1162). By the setting up of the Latin Kingdom and the appointment of a Latin Patriarch, the schism between East and West, which it might have been hoped the Crusade would have healed, was widened.

A second Crusade was preached (A.D. 1147) in the Pontificate of Eugenius III., by St. Bernard, who induced Conrad, the Emperor of Germany, and Louis VII. of France to join the expedition. Nothing, however, but a miserable loss of life was the result, not less than 200,000 men being said to have perished; the leaders were obliged to return to Europe with the scanty remnant of their hosts, even the great name of St. Bernard not being able to shelter him from blame for his part in the transaction.

In 1188, and the Pontificate of Urban III., Jerusalem again fell under the arms of the great Sultan, Saladin; the Latin Kingdom was destroyed, and Jerusalem brought into the power of the Infidels. All Europe was alarmed with the intelligence. Another attempt was made for its recovery, and a third Crusade, in which Philip Augustus of France and Richard Cœur de Lion took part, under Frederick Barbarossa, Emperor of Ger-

many, was undertaken. The Emperor was drowned whilst crossing the narrow river Cnidus, in Cilicia. The name of Richard of England, like that of Saladin, became a by-word for chivalry and bravery. But the Crusade came to nothing. Acre, about seventy miles distant from Jerusalem, was, after a siege of nearly two years (1189—1191), during which they suffered immense losses, through famine, the sword, and the climate, taken by the Christians. Acre thenceforward became the Metropolis of the Latin Christians, where the titular King and Patriarch continued to reside. The leaders, jealous of each other, quarrelled amongst themselves. Jerusalem was not recovered. Philip returned to France. Richard continued a year longer in Palestine, and defeated Saladin in a great battle. But he in vain demanded of him the restitution of Palestine and of the Holy Cross; all that he could obtain for the Christians was, that hostilities should be suspended for three years; that Christian pilgrims should enjoy full liberty; and that the Holy Sepulchre should be respected. Readers of English History will remember how on his way homewards, Cœur de Lion fell into the hands of the Emperor Henry VI., and was only ransomed by the payment of a large sum of money by England.

In 1193 the Great Saladin died at Damascus, and the hopes of Christendom revived. His last act was to order his winding-sheet to be carried, in the place of the standard, through every street of the city to signify the instability of human greatness. He left alms to be distributed in equal proportions between the Christians, Jews, and Mahometans. King Richard his adversary died A.D. 1199.

The Fourth Crusade was undertaken by the French and Venetians at the request of Pope Innocent III. Innocent found a powerful auxiliary in a Priest of Neuilly near Paris, named Fulk, who through his preaching created a strong enthusiasm through France and Flanders, which resulted in the Fourth Crusade. The French Barons resolved that a journey by sea

to the East was less exposed to risks than one by land. But the difficulty was how to procure transports sufficient to convey the Crusaders. Venice alone, the chief commercial city of Europe at that time, could supply them. They applied to the Doge Dandolo, a blind old man ninety-three years of age, who readily granted what they required, on the understanding that whatever conquests were made should be equally divided between the Barons and Venetians. The terms were accepted and the enterprise received the sanction of the Pope.

The armies having assembled at Venice, in October, A.D. 1202, a Fleet of four hundred and eighty vessels, conveying two hundred thousand Crusaders, with the aged Dandolo, who took the Vows of a Crusader, set sail, the expedition being entrusted to Boniface, Marquis of Montferrat, who was invested with the Cross of a Pilgrim and the Staff of a General.

But a change of purpose suddenly occurred. In spite of the wishes of the Pope, Dandolo prevailed on the Crusaders to assist him in recovering Zara, in Dalmatia, from the King of Hungary. No sooner was Zara taken, than Alexios, the young son of Isaac Angelos, Emperor of Constantinople, who had been deposed by a usurper, persuaded them to aid him in restoring his father to the throne; Innocent having forbidden their espousing his cause, differences arose between the French and Venetians, the former hesitating to disobey the Pope, whilst the Venetians were troubled by no such scruples. The Venetians prevailed; and although many of the Crusaders objected to stain their hands with the blood of their fellow-Christians, and left the camp, the greater part accepted the proposals of Alexios, and in July, 1203, entering Constantinople in triumph, restored the rightful Emperor to the throne, Alexios being crowned in Sophia as his colleague.

But Alexios failing to fulfil the promises which he had made, differences arose between the Greeks and Latins, which only ended in a disgraceful and brutal pillage of Constantinople, in April, A.D. 1204. In vain the conquered citizens implored mercy

from their victors; two thousand Greeks were wantonly murdered; sacrilege and plunder, even during Holy Week, prevailed everywhere; St. Sophia and other Churches were desecrated and robbed, Pictures of Christ and the Saints being torn down and trodden underfoot. The Patriarch stripped of his robes, unattended, and riding on an ass, was driven out of the city; an immense amount of spoil was carried off, amongst which were the bronze horses which now adorn the Piazza of St. Mark in Venice.

Such was the end of the Fourth Crusade; the original intention was abandoned, and war, instead of against the infidels, waged against Christians. Pope Innocent complained of the foul deeds—too foul to be described—which disgraced the name of Christians, accusing the Crusaders with respecting in their lust neither religion, nor age, nor sex.

The Imperial Crown was again transferred from the Greeks to the Latins in the person of Baldwin I. (1204—1205), Count of Flanders. The election of the Patriarch of Constantinople was committed to a Committee of twelve, half French, half Venetian, six being Prelates, and one of them the Pope's Legate. The Bishop of Soissons announced to the assembled chiefs the result of the Election. A schismatical Church was established, and the Patriarchate conferred on Thomaso Morosini, a Venetian. Thenceforward the rightful Greek Patriarch resided at Nice. Thus the Pope took advantage of the cruel and unmerited injustice, which had been inflicted on the Greek Patriarch and Christians; and thus the schism between the Eastern and Western Churches was further widened.

But the Latin Empire was weak and foredoomed from its birth. The aged Dandolo died A.D. 1205. Baldwin I. soon quarrelled with Boniface of Montferrat, and, A.D. 1206, died in prison. In 1207 Boniface was killed in battle. The reign of Henry (1206—1216), Baldwin's brother and successor, was one of comparative prosperity; but after his death the Latin Empire

suffered under a succession of weak and incompetent Rulers. In 1261, in the reign of Baldwin II. (1237—1261), Constantinople was recovered by the Greeks; Michael Palæologus (1261—1281) became Emperor; and in the same year the Greek Church was re-established in the East. The family of Palæologi continued to reign till the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, A.D. 1453.

We must not let the miserable tale of the Children's Crusade, about A.D. 1213, in the reign of Innocent III., pass altogether unnoticed. A camp of thirty thousand boys left Vendome in France to embark at Marseilles for Palestine. Before they arrived there ten thousand of their number were lost. Two merchants offered to take them, free of cost, to the Holy Land, "for the cause of God;" thousands of the number readily accepted the offer, only to find themselves at the end of their voyage exposed for sale in the slave-markets of Alexandria and Antioch.

In the Fifth Crusade Frederic II., Emperor of Germany, was the principal actor. Frederic, being at the time a widower, had, A.D. 1225, married Iolanta, daughter of John de Brienne, the titular King of Jerusalem, who, weary of his continual struggles with the Infidels, transferred to him his right to the Sovereignty of Jerusalem as his daughter's dowry. Frederic, as mentioned in the last chapter, had bound himself to Pope Honorius as the condition of his Coronation, to proceed within a certain time to the re-conquest of his new Kingdom, but for five years, owing to difficulties, real or pretended, delayed the fulfilment of his Vow. But at last, A.D. 1228, he set out, under the ban of excommunication of Gregory IX., the successor of Honorius, to be crowned at Jerusalem in right of his wife, who died in childbirth the same year.

In 1229 he arrived in Palestine and took the field against the Infidels. Here he so far succeeded as to make a truce for ten years with the Sultan, during which time the Christians were

allowed free access to Jerusalem, and Jaffa, Bethlehem, and Nazareth were yielded up to them. But when he entered Jerusalem, the Patriarch refused to crown him on the ground of his lying under the ban of excommunication ; whereupon Frederic, proceeding to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, took the Crown from the Altar, and himself put it on his own head. Having brought the Crusade to an end, and having, under the strong opposition and excommunication from the Pope, effected more for the Christians in Palestine than had been gained since the First Crusade, he returned to Europe.

The Sixth was an English Crusade led by Richard, brother of Henry III. of England, Earl of Cornwall, and sometime King of the Romans, and William Longsword, who obtained from the Sultan even more favourable terms than had been granted to Frederic II. Palestine was once more in the hands of the Christians, only, however, to fall, A.D. 1244, under a barbarous heathen foe, the Moguls, or Tartars, a people more ruthless and profane than any whom the Christians had encountered before, who plundered the Churches, violated the Holy Places, and subjected the Pilgrims to a brutal and indiscriminate slaughter.

The Seventh, A.D. 1248, and the Eighth Crusade, A.D. 1270, were conducted by St. Louis, King of France. When, on the point of recovering from an illness which had brought him to the point of death, he heard of the capture of Jerusalem by the Tartars, he vowed that if life was vouchsafed to him, he would proceed on a Crusade ; and received the Cross of a Crusader from the Archbishop of Paris. Circumstances, however, prevented him from carrying out his vow for four years. But on August 27, A.D. 1248, the expedition left France, and after spending nine months in Cyprus, the appointed place of meeting, arrived in Egypt, the conquest of which, it was thought, would facilitate the conquest of Palestine, and took Damietta.

But soon the fortune of war turned against them ; the Greek fire, and pestilence, and famine, committed a terrible havoc amongst

the Crusaders ; some of their principal leaders, and amongst them the Earl of Salisbury, with two hundred knights from England, perished, and Louis himself was taken prisoner. To the exorbitant demands of the enemy he lent a deaf ear. In vain they threatened him with torture of the most cruel kind ; “ I am yours,” he said, “ you can do with me as you will.” The noblest traits of his character were brought out by adversity, and gained the admiration of the Sultan ; a considerable deduction was made from the ransom which was at first demanded, and he was released from captivity. Having concluded a truce with the enemy for ten months, he visited the Holy Land, but was recalled to France, A.D. 1254, by the death of his mother.

But the vow of a Crusader was still upon him, and again in July, 1270, he left France for the East. But scarcely had he arrived in Africa, and laid siege to Tunis, when a contagious epidemic of great violence devastated his troops ; one of his sons, Tristan, a promising youth in his twenty-first year, succumbed ; on the very day of his death the King also was attacked, and at Tunis on August 25, A.D. 1270, followed his son to the grave. It may here be mentioned that to St. Louis is attributed the building of the beautiful Chapel, St. Chapelle, in Paris.

The year after the death of the King, to whom, if to any, the name of Saint is particularly applicable, the young Prince Edward (the future Edward I.), son of Henry III., who six years before had defeated and slain Simon de Montfort at the battle of Evesham, left England to join the Crusade. Edward succeeded in capturing Nazareth ; but that, as it was his first, so also was his last victory. Such was the terror which he instilled into the Infidels that they tried to encompass his death by an assassin, who, although he perished in the attempt, inflicted on him, by a poisoned dagger, a wound which baffled all the skill of the physicians. All are familiar with the tale which attributes

his cure to his wife Eleanor, who sucked with her lips the poison from the wound. However this may be, the Crusade was cut short by his illness, and Edward was obliged to return to England.

Other Crusades followed, but with no permanent result. Jerusalem was for a time recovered, but only to fall back into the hands of the Infidels. In 1291 Acre was captured by them; the King and Patriarch effected their escape, but the Christian Churches were demolished. And thus ended the Christian power in Palestine.

Instead of healing the divisions of Christendom, the Eastern and Western Churches, by the Crusades, became more estranged than before. The Roman Church added insult to injury. When Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, protested in a letter to Gregory IX., that the Greeks were not Schismatics, and exhorted him to union with them, the Pope exulted over their downfall. He taunted the Patriarch that the calamities of the Greeks were the just judgment of God, because they refused obedience to the successor of St. Peter; whilst the Roman Church, on the contrary, the Head and mistress of all Churches, enjoyed peace and tranquillity.

The Crusades were a miserable failure, but there was one gainer, and that was the Pope. But whether such chimerical enterprises, and such an enormous sacrifice of human life, was warrantable, and such as a Christian Bishop ought to have promoted, is open to question. No Pope was rash enough to place himself at the Head of a campaign; this risk they entrusted to their Legates.

A tax of a tenth, known as the Saladin tax, was imposed by the Popes on the Clergy and Laity of the West, for the service of the Holy Wars. Of these immense subsidies the Popes were the Bankers; and this was the groundwork of the Tithes or Tenths, which they continued to impose on the Benefices of the Church long after the necessity had ended, and which went

to swell the coffers of the Apostolic See. They sent their Legates, whose word and command were the voice of the Popes, to urge contributions ; and the inevitable abuse of power on the part of the Popes and Legates it is not difficult to imagine. But thus the Legates became a permanent institution. Thenceforward the pretensions of the Pope to create and depose Kings ; to set at nought the authority of Metropolitans in their Provinces and of Bishops in their Dioceses ; to be infallible in their judgments, and superior to Councils ; grew to such an alarming extent as to threaten a complete anarchy in Church and State.

Cotemporaneous with the Crusades was the rise of Gothic architecture. We have not space to give more than the faintest outline of the history of ecclesiastical architecture, but even in the matter of Church architecture the Eastern and Western Churches were at variance, and the Greeks, having once adopted their model, steadily adhered to it. In the West, on the contrary, it was progressive under the different features of Roman, Byzantine, Romanesque, Norman, and Gothic. In the West the earliest form was the Roman Basilica, either adapted or built on the plan of the Courts of Justice. When Constantine built Constantinople, most of the noble families, and with them probably many architects and masons, emigrated thither from Rome. Constantine himself was a native of the West ; and not unnaturally the plan of the Roman Basilica was adopted in the new Capital. But the Emperor Justinian was the Founder of a new form of architecture, which, from the ancient Byzantium, on the ruins of which Constantinople was built, took the name of Byzantine, the distinguishing feature of which was the Greek Cross and Cupolas ; and this style he, being then Emperor of both East and West, introduced also into Italy.

Thus there were two styles of architecture in Italy, the old Basilican and the Byzantine, Rome itself continuing to adhere to the former. As wealth increased, the piety of the Church

devoted a large portion of its revenues to the embellishment of its buildings ; Church building was regarded in the light of a thank-offering and oblation to God, to which purpose Kings and Nobles and rich gentry, sometimes in their life-time, but more frequently at their death, bequeathed a considerable portion of their worldly possessions. Hence a stimulus was given to Church architecture, and a new style arose, which continued to be called Byzantine, but also from its following the Roman form and arrangements, was called Romanesque ; and also Lombard, from its being first adopted in the Lombard cities of Italy.

We have but few remains in England of Churches previous to the Norman conquest. The Normans were great Church-builders, the characteristic feature of their architecture still continuing to be the round arch and column. Whether the Normans were superior to the Saxon masons, is an open question ; but by them the Cathedral in almost every Diocese was rebuilt on a more magnificent scale than before, and to them are to be ascribed many Cathedrals, and Parish Churches, often in small villages, for which England is in the present day distinguished.

Gothic Architecture grew out of the Romanesque. Several countries lay claim to having given it birth ; but there is no reason to give the priority of the style itself to any one in particular. It is perhaps more true, that though the pointed arch, window, and door, and lofty vaulted roof, were common to all, each country developed its characteristic style, influenced perhaps by masons passing from one country to another ; the Gothic architecture in England differing from that of France, and more perhaps from that of Germany.

One of the most remarkable revivals in the history of the Church took place in the closing years of the Twelfth, and in the early years of the Thirteenth Century.

The most zealous adherents of the Popes were the Monks.

The Popes, conscious of the services which the Monks were calculated to perform for the Papacy, took them under their special protection, and exempted the Monasteries from Episcopal superintendence. The cruel kindness of the Popes could not but be fatal to their protégés ; and the monks, left without control, sunk, as might easily have been foreseen, into sloth and laxity, and even worse practices. It was this degeneracy in the Monasteries which led to the rise of the Mendicant Orders.

In no other country was such a revival necessary as in England. The cities had been growing in wealth and importance, and the people were flocking more and more from the villages into the towns, the pauper population of which, as it increased in numbers, increased also in misery.

The existing Monastic system, under which the Monasteries were mostly built in remote and secluded districts, could at the best effect but little good under the altered circumstances. The primary principle of the older Monks had been to fly from the world. To go into the world ; to seek out poverty and misery in their own homes ; to have no houses or possessions of their own ; to live a life of poverty in the narrowest cells and on the hardest fare ; to carry thence the Church to the poor, and to identify themselves with the outcasts of the people ; to live on alms, and to abide in any house where they were bidden ; this was at first the principle of the Mendicants.

Pope Innocent III. had in the Lateran Council, A.D. 1215, forbidden any further foundations of monasteries ; but the circumstances of the times called forth the rise of the Friars during his own Pontificate.

The Mendicants consisted of four principal Orders, the Dominicans, Black Friars (*frères*), or Preachers ; the Franciscans, Grey Friars, or Minorites ; the Carmelites, or White Friars ; the Augustines, or Austin Friars. The new movement was not unconnected with the Albigensian and Waldensian heretics. The wealth and luxury of the Monasteries was sadly

at variance with the example set by these sects which gave up their worldly possessions to lead lives of poverty, self-denial, and austerity. The orthodox Christians were shamed into emulation; and the new movement had its origin in the same countries, Spain and France, with the view of carrying out the same principles, as the heretics whom the Church had persecuted.

The founder of the Dominican Order was St. Dominic Guzman (1170—1221), a member of a noble Spanish family, who had been previously employed by Pope Innocent III., in a Crusade (a name which included all expeditions for the Cross), against the Albigenses. St. Dominic had the imputation of being the Founder of the Inquisition. It was the especial work of this inhuman tribunal to enquire into, or rather to put down by any means, heretical opinions. Persons of infamous character, whose evidence would have been rejected in any other court of law, were admitted as witnesses; neither they nor the accusers were confronted with the accused; as to who the accusers, or what the charge brought against him were, except that it was one of Heresy, the defendant was left in entire ignorance; if he could not prove himself innocent of the Heresy, he was condemned to death; his family was beggared, his property confiscated, part going to the judges who condemned him, another part being consigned to the Papal Exchequer.

The Dominican Order having received the sanction of Pope Honorius A.D. 1216, came into England A.D. 1221. Dominic was canonised by Pope Gregory IX., A.D. 1235.

The Franciscan Order was founded by John Bernardini (1182—1226), a native of Assisi, to whom the name of Francis or Francois (from his proficiency in the French language), was given, and who is generally known as St. Francis of Assisi. His Order, which obtained the sanction of Pope Innocent III. in 1210, was introduced into England A.D. 1224. He also was canonised by Gregory, A.D. 1228.

The Carmelites ^a after the expulsion of the Latins from Palestine came over to Europe. They had at their own request received about A.D. 1209 a very rigid Rule from St. Albert, Patriarch of Jerusalem. They however received some relaxation under Pope Innocent IV., and coming into England A.D. 1250, adopted the Mendicant System. In 1252 they were followed by the reformed Augustines, or Austin Friars, the original foundation of which Order dates from St. Augustine of Hippo, in 388.

The vow of poverty by which they were bound was soon evaded. Basking in the favour of the Popes, they could beg with the greatest importunity, and received donations and benefactions to any amount ; so that before long, whilst boasting of being the poorest, they became the richest community in Christendom. As early as A.D. 1259 they had erected magnificent buildings ; they were no longer to be found in the hovels of the poor, but in the halls of the rich and Palaces of Princes. They became a power in the Universities, the Dominicans taking the lead at Paris, the Franciscans at Oxford, and under the influence of the Friars Oxford and Cambridge gained a high reputation for education and learning. Here they established separate Houses for their own Orders, endowing Colleges and Halls for poor scholars, and it is to the Friars that England is indebted for the origin of Colleges at the two Universities. Although St. Francis had contemned all learning, except just so much as was required for reading the Bible, his followers cultivated it, collected libraries at any price (for money was always forthcoming), and filled the Professors' Chairs at the Universities, and many of the Friars were eminent as Divines and Scholars.

“What the Jesuits were after Luther began the Reformation, that,” says Mosheim, “the Dominicans and Franciscans were from the Thirteenth Century till the time of Luther.” From that time they had supreme power in Church and State ; held

^a See p. 443.

the highest Ecclesiastical and Civil offices ; and defended the Roman Pontiff against Kings and Bishops.

Pope Alexander IV. exempted them from the jurisdiction of Bishops, and gave them free license to act everywhere, to preach, to administer the Sacraments, to give Absolution, without asking the permission of the Parish Clergy or of the Bishops. If the Parish Priest refused Absolution the Friar would give it. If the Friars were refused the Churches, they had only to erect an ambulatory pulpit, from which they railed against the Parish Clergy as “dumb dogs” and “cursed hirelings.” They forced themselves into the Parsonages, where they were feared as snakes in the grass, and betrayed their host’s hospitality, by denouncing him as a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber. Instead of begging for alms, they would claim them as their right ; we are told by Fitz-Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh, in the middle of the Fourteenth Century, that they would enter into houses and forcibly carry off whatever they could lay hands on. Fitz-Ralph wrote an *Apology against the Friars*, which so irritated them, that they complained of him to their friend the Pope. Innocent VI. took the part of the Friars, and summoned him to appear before him at Avignon, and wrote to the English Bishops forbidding them to interfere. Thus, basking in the favour of the Popes, they became a nuisance to society and the arch-dissenters of the day.

The two principal Orders, the Dominicans and Franciscans, soon took to quarrelling amongst themselves, and the Church was long scandalised by the coarse invectives and bitter accusations with which each party assailed the other. The Franciscans also were soon divided into two parties. They were forbidden by their founder to possess houses or property ; this, however, was mitigated by a Bull of Pope Gregory IX., A.D. 1231, and another of Pope Innocent IV., A.D. 1245 ; a distinction was drawn between *use* and *property* ; they might enjoy the usufruct, but the property belonged to the Pope. Hence arose a schism in the Order, between the Zealous and the Spiritual on one side, who ad-

hered to the Will of their Founder and advocated *Evangelical poverty*; and those on the other side, who followed the Bull of the Popes.

On the accession of Pope Celestine V., the rigorists formed themselves into a separate community, living a life of the strictest solitude and poverty, and took from him the name of Celestines; but the privileges accorded to them by that Pope were annulled by his successor, Boniface VIII. This only widened the breach between the Spirituals and the other members of the Order. Clement V., by the Bull *Exivi de Paradiso* (A.D. 1312), by a new explanation of the Rule of St. Francis, tried in vain to heal the schism. John XXII. issued (A.D. 1317) the Bull *Gloriosam Ecclesiam*, and put the Inquisition in motion against the Spirituals, whose poverty and self-denying lives put the luxurious living of the Pope to shame. But rather than submit to a compromise, they preferred to be thrust out of the Church as heretics; and these ejected brethren, who were called Fratricelli, or Fratres Minores, and Beghards or Beguines, together with the Tertiaries (those, viz., who adopted the third and strict Rule of St. Francis), formed a separate party in opposition to the Popes, and were consequently subjected to the extreme rigour of the Inquisition.

The main body of the Friars formed, however, the body-guard of the Popes, and through them the Church of Rome added to its Faith many new doctrines which differentiate it from the Church of England. Under them in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, although it was not adopted as an article of Roman faith till the publication of the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus* in the Pontificate of Pius IX., made great advances. The idea of her being a Mediatrix with the Son had been inculcated by St. Bernard. St. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, held that she was born in sin but sanctified by the special Operation of the Holy Ghost. A Festival corresponding in date with that of the

Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the English Calendar, was instituted to her Immaculate Conception, but this did not originally refer to her own conception from her mother, but to her Conception of the Saviour.

The dogma as now held by the Roman Church was opposed by St. Bernard, and in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries was the subject of a sharp controversy between Franciscans and Dominicans, the former upholding, the latter rejecting it. Still the Dominicans, whilst they rejected the Dogma, considerably helped it forward by their extravagant language; for though they attributed *Latria* to the Divine Nature, *Dulia* to the Saints, and *Hyperdulia* to the Human Nature of our Lord, they afterwards transferred the last from the Son to the Mother.

St. Dominic promoted a devotion in honour of the Virgin. People were instructed to repeat the *Ave Maria* one hundred and fifty times, and the Lord's Prayer fifteen times, once after each decade of Aves. St. Thomas Aquinas, a member of the Dominican Order, taught that "there is an immense Treasury of good works, performed by holy men *over and above what duty* requires (it is this doctrine which under the name of Works of Supererogation, is condemned by the fourteenth Article of the Church of England); that the Roman Pontiff is the keeper and distributor of this Treasure, who is able out of the inexhaustible fund to transfer to every one such an amount of Good Works, as his necessities require, or will suffice to avert the punishment of his sins." The next step was the sale of *Indulgences*, which brought in a fruitful addition to the Papal treasury, and of which we shall have more to say when we arrive at the time of the Reformation.

Amongst the staunchest allies of the Pope were the Schoolmen, or the advocates of the Scholastic Philosophy, which was in vogue in the West during the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. It is said to have had its precursor in John Scotus Erigena, and in more recent times in Archbishop Anselm and

Abelard ; but all its principal adherents belonged to the Mendicant Orders, some, under the guidance of St. Thomas Aquinas, being Dominicans, and others, the followers of Duns Scotus, belonging to the Franciscans. Differing amongst themselves in almost everything else (the uniform character of their Philosophy excepted), they agreed on one point, their loyalty to the Popes. It is impossible, even if it were desirable, within our space, to give more than a superficial sketch of their system.

Their object was to prove by natural reason the dogmas of the Church, with a view to which they started from the intelligible basis that true Faith can never be opposed to right Reason.

Christianity had from very early times allied itself with Philosophy, as the handmaid of Theology (*philosophia ancilla theologiæ*). Plato had hitherto been the favourite, and was considered the orthodox, teacher of Philosophy, whilst Aristotle lay under the ban of the Church ; the latter being denounced by Tertullian as the Patriarch of heretics, whilst his writings were condemned as late as in a Council at Paris, about 1209. But their writings had more recently become better known through the medium of translations, and Aristotle was recognised, as far at least as his logical works were concerned, as the infallible authority. Suspicion, however, seemed to continue to be attached to him, for we find Luther speaking of him as a most rascally knave (*sceleratissimus ille nebulo, Aristoteles*).

It is difficult at first sight to understand what Christianity can have to do with Philosophy ; the Schoolmen, however, thought differently, and availed themselves of its help. As Heretics and unbelievers, in their attacks on Christianity, had drawn their weapons from the armoury of Philosophy, as a seductive and plausible means by which to draw away Christian believers from the right Faith ; so the Schoolmen also were induced to go and do likewise, and to oppose Philosophy by Philosophy. Hence

they had recourse to Aristotle, to teach them the dialectical Philosophy, as their model.

But at the very outset, a difficulty occurred on the theory of Ideas, as to which the Aristotelians and Platonists had been at variance even in the life-time of those Philosophers. The logical question as to Universals, or abstract terms, at once arose ; whether they were mere names and sounds (*afflatus vocis*), as held by the adherents of Aristotle, or real objective realities, corresponding with the Ideas (*ιδέαι*) of Plato. Those who held the former opinion were called Nominalists ; the advocates of the latter were Realists, and into these two classes the Schoolmen were broken up.

Scholastic subtlety and scholastic trifling is the not undeserved verdict which posterity has passed upon the system. Where everything was a matter of doubt and wrangling, and was subjected to the crucible of logic and dialectics, the outcome must necessarily have fostered a Religion of the head rather than of the heart ; whilst the dryness inseparable from the system must have tended to obscure, rather than edify, the minds of the people. The perfection of man, according to the Schoolmen, lay in the perfection of his Intelligence, by means of which, God and the deepest Mysteries of the Faith are to be apprehended through a Syllogistic process. But Religion has to do with the heart, not with the head ; and even, were it otherwise, the Syllogistic process is least of all adapted to establish truth. Given a false Premiss, a Syllogism may be perfectly true in form, but must be materially wrong. And the premisses from which the Schoolmen started *were* false, not taken from the Bible, but, from what was supposed to be, the *Traditions* of the Church.

But it was a time when false traditions and false doctrines had crept into the Church, and when the fountain-head itself, from which the Schoolmen started, needed purifying. If they professed to base their system on the Scriptures, yet it was on the

Vulgate translation, not on the original language. The Greek language, in which the New Testament was written, was almost wholly unknown, and the Bible was read in the West only through the medium of Latin translations. The writings of the ancient Fathers and the decrees of Œcumenical Councils were only to be gathered from second-hand, and often spurious, sources, or were confined to the inaccessible libraries of the Monasteries.

The education supplied in the Schools of the day was mostly confined to the Trivium and Quadrivium, as they were called, the former including Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic ; the latter Arithmetic, Geometry, Music, and Astronomy. The principal text-book in use was the *Book of Sentences* of Peter Lombard, a native of Novara, and Bishop of Paris (1159—1164), the *Father of Sentences*, as he is called. It was a shorter cut to knowledge than the study of the Bible and the Fathers ; a system of Divinity selected from those writings, but embodying the prevalent doctrines of the Church, including Seven Sacraments ; this the Schoolmen adopted as their groundwork, and to it they added the subtleties of their own Philosophy.

The text-book of the Canonists, or students of Ecclesiastical Law, was the *Decretum* of Gratian, a Benedictine Monk of Bologna (a city famous for its Law-schools), who entertained the highest notions of the Papal prerogatives. In that work, which was written about A.D. 1152, Canons of Councils, the Forged Decretals, and Papal sentences, were mixed together in a concordant compendium. This collection, which was not considered to go far enough to meet the after-development of Popery, was afterwards supplemented with Decretals of later Popes, and in that form was received with approbation, and became the highest authority on the subject, adding immensely to the influence of the Popes.

We must content ourselves with giving little more than the names of the principal Schoolmen of the Thirteenth Century.

Amongst them St. Thomas Aquinas, or Thomas of Aquino (1226—1274), *the Anglical Doctor*, as he was called, holds the first place. He was a man of Royal and even Imperial descent, his grandfather having married the sister of the Emperor Frederic I. He belonged to the Dominican Order, was an Aristotelian, and Founder of the school of Thomists. To him is ascribed a great work, *The Sum of Theology* (*Summa totius Theologiæ*), a burden too heavy for the shoulders of one man, Roger Bacon says of it. It consisted of three parts, the *Prima Pars*, *Secunda Pars* (this again divided into two, *Prima Secundæ* and *Secunda Secundæ*, in which last he asserts the infallibility of the Popes), and *Tertia Pars*, containing decrees of Popes, Canons of Councils, and extracts from the Fathers. This work became the standard of Orthodoxy in the Western Church.

Next to Aquinas ranks Duns Scotus, who, to judge from the latter name, was probably descended from a Scotch or Irish family, and is said to have been born at Dunstane in Northumberland, from which place he received the abbreviated name of Duns. He, the Leader of the Scotists against the Thomists, or followers of Aquinas, belonged to the Order of the Franciscans, and he is said to have delivered Lectures, first at Oxford, and, about A.D. 1300, at Paris, and to have died, A.D. 1308, at Cologne, at about the age of forty. Both an Aristotelian and a Platonist, he was styled the *Subtle Doctor*, and was considered in his day a marvel of learning; in which verdict, however, posterity does not seem to have agreed, if, as has been thought, the name of *Dunce* is derived from him.

Albert, surnamed the Great, who was born of a noble family in Suabia, entered the Dominican Order at Cologne. Under him Aquinas studied, and although inferior to his great pupil, Albert was so conversant with nearly every range of human study, that he was styled *the Universal Doctor*. So universal, in fact, was his knowledge, that his friends thought he must be inspired, whilst his enemies believed that such knowledge was only com-

patible with the work of the evil spirit. In 1263 he resigned the Bishopric of Ratisbon, which he had reluctantly accepted, and returned to his monastic life at Cologne.

Bonaventura (1221—1274), a native of Tuscany, Cardinal Bishop of Albano, who is said to have refused the Papacy, was also a Franciscan, and was honoured with the title of *the Seraphic Doctor*. He completed his studies under Alexander of Hales, and was a man of so holy character that it was said of him, that in Bonaventura, Adam seemed not to have sinned.

Alexander of Hales (died 1245), styled the *Irrefragable Doctor*, was a Franciscan, and the Author of the Syllogistic form of argument adopted by the Schoolmen.

William of Ockham, born at Ockham in Surrey, was also a Franciscan, and a pupil of Duns Scotus in Paris, differing, however, from his master, inasmuch as he was the leader, if not the founder, of the Nominalistic School; he received the name of *the Singular Doctor*. The Nominalists were not always, like the Realists, the blind supporters of the Papacy. Ockham at any rate took up a decided anti-papal position; he questioned the infallibility of the Popes even in doctrinal matters, and denied their authority altogether in secular affairs. He wrote against Pope John XXII., who canonised Aquinas, a Work "On the Poverty of Christ," and was in consequence excommunicated by the Pope.

A man of superior ability to all the Schoolmen was Roger Bacon (1214—1292), who from the universality of his gifts was called *the Admirable Doctor*. Born at Ilchester, and educated at Oxford and Paris, at which latter University he had Grosseteste, afterwards the famous Bishop of Lincoln, as his fellow-pupil, he joined the Franciscan community. He, however, devoted himself chiefly to Physical Sciences, Astronomy, Mathematics, and Chemistry, so that he can scarcely be reckoned amongst the Theological Philosophers of his time. But he condemned the narrow-mindedness and superstition of his brother Schoolmen,

who shut their eyes to the necessity of reform, and by throwing out alarming words on that dangerous subject, rendered himself obnoxious, not only to the Pope, but to both orders of Dominicans and Franciscans. He was accused of practising magical arts, and was sentenced by Jerome of Ascoli, General of the Franciscan Order, and Legate at Paris of Pope Nicolas III., to imprisonment in a Monastery. There he wore away ten years of his valuable life, dying, how long after his release is uncertain, at Oxford.

There was nothing in the Romish system, says Archbishop Trench, that the Schoolmen were not ready to support. The denial of the Cup to the Laity ; Transubstantiation ; Simony if practised by a Pope ; Purgatory ; Indulgences ; the Burning of heretics—matters like these they never questioned, or if they did, it was only to establish them on a firmer footing than before.

CHAPTER XV.

THE EVE OF THE REFORMATION.

NEW doctrines which had been imported into the Church—The Albigenses—Waldenses—Low condition of the Church—Pope Clement V.—The Babylonish Captivity—Battles of Crécy and Poitiers—Extortions of the Popes—Council of Vienne—Dissolution of the Knights Templar—Pope John XXII.—Nicolas V., Antipope—Revision of the Canon Law—The Pope accused of heresy—Benedict XII., Pope—Clement VI., Pope—Diet of Frankfurt—The Pope excommunicates the Emperor—Diet of Spires—Charles IV., Emperor—The Black Death—Anarchy at Rome—Rienzi excommunicated—Flies from Rome—His return—His murder—Innocent VI., Pope—The Golden Bull—Urban V., Pope—The Emperor Palæologus—Gregory XI., Pope—Attempts of reunion between East and West—Return of the Papacy to Rome—The Great Roman Schism—Urban VI.—Twenty-eight Cardinals appointed—Rival Popes—Church of England—Reynolds, Archbishop of Canterbury—Extortions of the Popes—Edward III. remonstrates with the Pope—Islip, Archbishop of Canterbury—Statutes of *Provisors* and *Premunire*—The conduct of King John reprobated—Serious condition of the Church of England under Papal exactments—Piers Ploughman's Vision—Dissatisfaction in England—Wicliffe—Summoned before Courtney, Bishop of London—John of Gaunt—Murder of Archbishop Sudbury—Courtney, Archbishop—The *Earthquake Council*—Wicliffe's Bible—His Death—Result of Wicliffe's teaching on the Continent—The Lollards—New Statutes of *Provisors* and *Premunire*—Arundel, Archbishop—Statute *de Hæretico Comburendo*—The University of Paris—Peter d'Ailly—Gerson—The Gallican Liberties asserted against the Popes—The Cardinals determine to end the Papal Schism—Council of Pisa—Of Constance—Martin V., Pope—The Roman Schism ended—Communion in One kind decreed—Burning of John Huss and Jerome of Prague—Hussite War—The Calixtines—Martin V., the founder of Ultra-Montanism—Eugenius IV., Pope—Council of Basle—Attempt of reunion between East and West—Failure of Councils to reform the Church—The Pragmatic Sanction of France—The Concordat—The Pragmatic Sanction of Germany—England denationalised by the Popes—The Wars of the Roses—Character of the Fifteenth Century—Invention of Printing—Fall of Constantinople—Ineffectual attempts for a Crusade—The Medici Family—Pope Nicolas V.—Influx of Greek Scholars into Italy—Irrreligious effect of the Renaissance—Savonarola—Cardinal Bessarion—Pope Pius II.—Paul II.—Platina, the Historian—Sixtus IV., Pope—Innocent VIII.—Alexander VI.—Savonarola executed—Julius II., Pope—Leo X.—Education in England—Humanism in England—Grocyn—Linacre—Colet—Erasmus—At Oxford—His *Moriæ Encomium*—At Cambridge—His Translation of the New Testament—He prepares the way for the Reformation.

It will have been observed how that of late years many strange doctrines and customs, repugnant to the Word of God and the earliest days of Christianity, had crept into the Church, and that they had been greatly fostered by the Schoolmen and Friars in the Thirteenth Century. Transubstantiation, as decreed by the Lateran Council A.D. 1215, and the reception of the Holy Eucharist once a year; Communion *in One kind*, although not yet enacted, by degrees coming into practice in the Church; the Treasury of Grace, and the doctrine of works of Supererogation; the purchase of Masses in composition for sins; the sale of Indulgences; a special and excessive worship of the Virgin Mary; such were some of the novelties which, like weeds in a fair garden, encumbered the Church, and called for reform.

When in the latter years of the Ninth, and throughout the Tenth Centuries, the Papacy was filled by the wicked Popes, the Church, following the example set by its Ruler, was too corrupt to trouble itself about Religion or matters of Faith. But when in the Eleventh and following Centuries, some revival took place, heresies also sprang up, most important amongst which were those of the Albigenses and Waldenses, at the end of the Twelfth and the beginning of the Thirteenth Centuries.

The Albigenses were a French sect, who probably derived their name from Albi in Languedoc; they were known also as *Cathari* (a synonym of *Puritans*), and Petrobussians, which last title they derived from Peter de Bruys, who was burnt in the early years of the Twelfth Century for teaching heretical doctrines in Languedoc and Provence. They were an offshoot of the Paulicians, who held Manichæan errors; and as they founded their opinions not on the Bible, but on human reason, they can scarcely be considered a Christian sect at all. Their principal tenet was the dualism of the Godhead; the Supreme God being distinct from the Creator of the world and of matter; they

repudiated, amongst other Christian doctrines, the Sacraments, denied the Resurrection of the body, and held that marriage was a mortal sin. A Crusade against them was entrusted by Pope Innocent III. to Simon de Montfort (the father of the more famous de Montfort, who headed the English Barons in the reign of Henry III.), and after a war, lasting for twenty years (1209—1229), they were put down with a merciless severity too common at that time. Tens of thousands of their number perished by the sword or the stake, those of them who still survived being given over by Pope Gregory IX. to the tender mercies of the Inquisition, whilst their beautiful country was converted into a desert.

A different sect, doctrinally, (although frequently confounded with them), were the Waldenses or Vaudois, founded, about A.D. 1170, by Peter Waldo, a rich merchant of Lyons, (after which city they were called the *Poor Men of Lyons*); who, crossing the Alps, sought refuge from persecution in the secluded valleys of Piedmont. Peter Waldo, having obtained from some friends a copy of the Gospels, resolved to adopt them as his rule of life, as a step towards which he sold his possessions for distribution amongst the poor. At the same time he resolved to form a religious guild, not (at any rate in the first instance) with the intention of effecting a doctrinal reform; for, although he considered that the Church of Rome had sadly deviated from the early purity and simplicity of the Faith, yet he continued to accept the Sacraments of the Church; but to exalt and purify its practice according to the principles of the Bible.

But such a reform, not proceeding directly from the Church itself, was looked upon at Rome with suspicion, and as deserving death. His followers failed to receive the sanction of Innocent III. in the Lateran Council, A.D. 1215, and were, like the Albigenses, put under the ban of the Church, although they were

not subjected to the same cruel penalties. In fact, the Waldenses held the Albigenses in the greatest abhorrence, and this repugnance to a common enemy created a bond of union with Rome, and to this is to be attributed the immunity under which they were allowed to live.

Men of simple tastes, the Waldenses had much in common with the Quakers of modern time, and their lives were a strict protest against the unholy living of many Catholics of the day. Their doctrines were not dissimilar to those of Wicliffe; they taught that the Church ought not to hold endowments; that the character of the Priest affected the validity of the Sacraments; the Bible they read, and heard the services of the Church, in their own language, instead of in the Latin of the Church of Rome.

The greatness of the Church of Rome had reached its climax when Boniface VIII. ascended the Papal throne; his Pontificate forms an epoch in the history of the Papacy, and from his time is to be dated its decline and fall. The Church had lost its moral influence, a period of ignorance and general depravity set in, and it seemed as if with the Fourteenth Century, the Dark Ages had returned. Both learning and Religion sank to the lowest ebb. The little learning which existed was such as the subtleties and hair-splitting quibbles of the Schoolmen afforded. The Clergy and monks were as conspicuous for their vices as for their ignorance. Bishoprics were combined with worldly dignities; and being conferred through influence and courtly favour, were held as secular possessions, and sinecures. Corruption and nepotism disgraced the Papacy; the Popes lived as secular Princes, often leading grossly immoral lives, enriching their illegitimate children and relatives at the expense of the Church; caring little for their spiritual duties; so that the complaint widely prevailed that they were serving Satan rather than God, and preparing the way for Antichrist.

The preposterous claims and arrogance of Boniface VIII., and

the miserable end of his Pontificate, involved more than his own fate. With his humiliation is immediately connected the transfer of the Papacy from Rome to Avignon, a step fatal to the independence of the Popes, to be followed by the Great Schism which was fatal to the unity of Rome. To heal that Schism, the Three Councils were held, in which the Roman Cardinals themselves insisted that a reformation of the Church, in its Head and branches, was necessary. Next followed the Revival of Learning; and then (as a consequence of all) the Reformation.

But we are anticipating.

Pope Clement V., the next successor but one to Boniface, was, as before stated, a Frenchman, and Bishop of Bordeaux. In the procession which followed his election, and in which the King of France held the Pope's bridle and rode by his side, the Pope was thrown from his horse; an evil omen, as it was considered at the time, which was soon to receive a fatal fulfilment. In 1309, Clement inflicted a severe blow on the Papacy by removing the Papal Chair to Avignon, which, though in the territory of the King of Sicily, was on the borders of France. There it remained for nearly seventy years (1309—1377), a period which Italian writers compared to the Babylonish captivity; during which all the Popes, and the majority of the Cardinals elected, were Frenchmen; and little better than puppets of the Kings of France. There they lived as mere men, and bad men, of the world, and, losing their spiritual authority, were regarded, especially in England, as a political institution. It was the time when a state of war existed between England and France, and the battles of Crécy and Poitiers were fought; so that the money extorted from England by the Popes went to swell the exchequer of the enemies of England.

The decline of their revenues in Italy, during their absence from Rome, led the Popes to seek other means of enriching themselves, and their extortions, which were bad enough when they were in Italy, became still worse whilst they were at Avignon.

Living on the confines of France, they were careful to keep on good terms with the French, but their pretensions and demands on other countries proportionably increased. We read of *Reservations*, *Expectatives*, the permanent imposition of *Annates*, or *First-fruits*, of *Tenths*, and the sale of *Indulgences*.

Clement, desirous, like his predecessor Benedict XI. had been, of obliging Philip of France, withdrew all that was obnoxious in the Bulls *Clericis Laicos* and *Unam Sanctam*, and the proceedings of Boniface against Philip were expunged from the Papal register. In his Pontificate, the Council of Vienne (1311—1312), the only General Council of the Fourteenth Century, was held. Three subjects were brought before it by the Pope; (1) the suppression of the Knights Templar; (2) a Crusade to the Holy Land; (3) the Reformation of the Church. The Crusade was discussed, only with the effect of showing that all the Crusading enthusiasm was a thing of the past. Durandus, Bishop of Mende, denounced as the prevailing evils of the time, Simony, Pluralities, the ignorance and luxurious living of the Clergy, the holding of secular appointments by Bishops, the exemption of Monasteries from Episcopal control, and the celibacy of the Clergy; and he demanded that a General Council should be held, once in every ten years, for the reform of the Church, and especially the exorbitant pretensions of the Popes.

By the Council of Vienne the Order of the Knights Templar was dissolved. They had in time amassed great wealth, erected palatial buildings, and being exempted from all Episcopal control, except that of the Pope, had evaded the Rules of their Order, and acquired an evil notoriety for covetousness, insolence, and licentiousness. Originally instituted for the defence of the Holy Land against the Saracens, they had become the persecutors of the Church and of the Eastern Patriarchs, and had often made common cause with, and adopted the opinions as well as the vices of, the Infidels. They had an enemy in Philip the Fair, who coveted their wealth; and having been allured by

him into France by treachery, they were subjected to fearful privations and cruelty, and were suppressed by Clement, who presided at the Council, and was a mere tool in the hands of the King.

Fresh troubles which arose between the Emperor Henry VII. (1308—1314) and Pope Clement, were assuming a serious aspect, when the Emperor died, his death being, as was supposed, caused by a poisoned wafer administered to him in the Eucharist by a Monk.

On the death of Pope Clement, which occurred in the same year as that of the Emperor, the election of his successor was delayed through differences as to whether an Italian or a French Pope should be chosen ; in the end, but not till the Papacy had been vacant for two years, at the instigation of France, the choice of the electors fell on the Cardinal Bishop of Oporto, a learned but violent old man, seventy years of age, who assumed the title of John XXII. (1316—1334). The new Pope, who was a little deformed man of mean birth, reserved to himself all the Benefices of Christendom, and by the imposition of Annates accumulated an incredible sum of money, especially from England.

In 1314 there was a disputed election of the successor of the Emperor Henry VII., Frederick, son of the Emperor Albert I. (who died A.D. 1308), being elected by one party, and Lewis of Bavaria by another. The victory ultimately rested with Lewis IV. (1308—1347). The Pope claimed that in the event of a disputed election, the matter ought to have been referred to him, and (A.D. 1324) excommunicated Lewis. The Germans took part with Lewis ; the Bull of Excommunication was treated as a dead letter, and he was crowned at Rome, in January, A.D. 1328. In the same year he retaliated by excommunicating the Pope, and by setting up an Antipope, Nicolas V. (1328—1329). The Antipope, however, abjured his error, and submitted himself to the rightful Pope ; he was granted the kiss of peace, but consigned for the rest of his life to a prison at Avignon.

In the first year of John's Pontificate, in order to meet the still growing assumptions of the Pope's prerogative, a final revision of the Roman Canon-law was effected. Certain additions which had been made under Pope Clement V. are known as the *Clementines*, whilst those made under John XXII. go by the name of *Extravagantes*, as *wandering outside* the previous collections.

Towards the end of his Pontificate, John exposed himself to a charge of heresy, through maintaining in a sermon that the Saints do not enjoy the full Beatific vision of God until the Resurrection; nor was the recantation which he made of his heresy accepted as satisfactory. Shortly afterwards he died; he had used, or rather abused, his Pontificate, as a means of getting money and enriching his family. He claimed Annates for three years from all the Benefices of Christendom, drawing from England an incredible sum of money; and at his death left behind him a character for insatiable avarice.

The next Pope, Benedict XII. (1334—1342), a Frenchman, was a man of learning and piety, less avaricious than his predecessor. Benedict had taken part in the controversy which arose out of the late Pope's heresy. He now declared *ex Cathedrâ*, that the Saints, although they do not till the day of judgment enjoy their perfect consummation in body and soul, yet do already possess the Beatific Vision and perfect happiness.

Clement VI. (1342—1352), who followed Benedict, a man of learning, was remarkable for his avarice, and, greater even than Papal, nepotism. He was wholly given up to the interests of France; out of ten Cardinals whom he appointed, nine were Frenchmen. The quarrels between the Pope and Emperor, Lewis IV., still continued. When the Emperor, who was sincerely desirous of a reconciliation, sent a message to Avignon with that view, the only answer he received was a demand that he should resign the Empire, which the Pope insisted that he held as a fief of Rome. The Emperor brought the matter before a Diet at Frankfort, A.D. 1344. The greatest indignation was

excited at the Pope's demands, and it even extended to the Emperor himself, who was accused of weakness and lenity in dealing with the Pope; and the Electors determined that they would have no more Bavarian Emperors.

Notwithstanding this, the Pope excommunicated and deposed the Emperor, (the words of the Excommunication are really too blasphemous to be repeated), and induced the Electors to choose in his place Charles of Moravia. A Diet of Spires, however, denied the Pope's power to depose an Emperor. The new King of the Romans, being refused coronation at Aix-la-Chapelle, the usual place for that ceremony, was, with the Pope's sanction, crowned at Bonn. Germany was now in a state bordering on civil war, which was only averted by the death of Lewis, through a fall from his horse, A.D. 1347.

On the death of Lewis, the election of Charles IV. (1347—1378) was confirmed, and he took peaceable possession of the throne. But an equally strong feeling, and on the same ground, that of his Papal predilections, existed against the new Emperor, as had existed against his predecessor; and, although he was an eminent patron of literature and art, he was stigmatised as the *Priests' Emperor*.

In 1347 occurred the pestilence known as the Black Death, which was particularly fatal to the Clergy, but more especially to the Dominican and Franciscan Friars; and which is said to have carried off three-fourths of the population of Avignon. In England it numbered amongst its victims Ufford, Archbishop elect, and Bradwardine, Archbishop of Canterbury.

By the residence of the Popes at Avignon, Rome was left in a state of anarchy, and became a prey to various kinds of disorder. In the Pontificate of Clement VI. the Republican spirit, which had slept for two hundred years since the execution of Arnold of Brescia, revived, and the year 1347 was marked by the revolution of Rienzi. Cola di Rienzi, who was generally supposed to be the son of a Roman inn-keeper, with

a washerwoman for his mother, but who prided himself on an Imperial, although illegitimate, parentage, arose as a religious, no less than a civil, Reformer. Having spent the first twenty years of his life at Anagni, he then went to Rome, where he became a notary; and he must have soon gained a considerable reputation, for, A.D. 1343, he was chosen by the Roman people to proceed on a commission to Avignon, to persuade Clement to return to Rome, and to institute another Jubilee. For a time he charmed the Pope by his eloquence; but soon falling into disgrace, was reduced to such a state of poverty that he was forced to solicit the charity of a public hospital at Avignon. Regaining the favour of the Pope he was enabled to return to Rome as Papal notary; and in May, A.D. 1347, accompanied to the Capitol by Raymond, Bishop of Orvieto, the Roman Legate, he was crowned as Tribune with dictatorial power; all orders of the people, the Clergy, the Nobles, the Gentry, the Judges, and the Artizans, swearing to observe the salutary laws which he enacted for the Good Estate.

A man of commanding presence and impulsive eloquence, he persuaded the Romans, that fallen though Rome was, it was still capable of recovering much of its ancient glory. All the calamities of the times he attributed to the absence of the Popes at Avignon. He professed himself the friend of the Church, but the reformer of the abuses of the Papacy. But the murder of his brother, and the impunity of the assassins, lent a stimulus to personal vengeance. For seven months—May to December, A.D. 1347—Rome lay prostrate at the feet of the Tribune, and never was the energy of a simple mind more remarkably felt than in his sudden but transient ascendancy. His tribunal, says Gibbon, was always accessible to the poor and stranger; neither birth, nor office, nor the immunity of the Church could protect the malefactor or his accomplices. A monk of St. Anastasio was hanged for his crimes. The hand of Rienzi fell heavily on the highest families of Rome. A Colonna was imprisoned for

debt. An Orsini, the nephew of two Cardinals, being charged with various acts of rapine and violence, was dragged from his Palace, and after a trial, the people being summoned by the bell of the Capitol, heard the sentence of death pronounced against him, and, with his hands bound behind him, was led forth to execution. Thus no malefactor at Rome, of whatever rank, could hope for impunity; the city was purged of its corruptions; a civil and religious reform was effected.

All this time, the Tribune professed the greatest reverence for the Pope, and had the Papal Legate for his friend. But with the growth of power came pride, and pomp, and luxurious living. The Tribune assumed the title of Augustus. Intoxicated with glory, he soon showed himself unfit to carry on the government which he had founded; the grandeur which he affected disgusted no less the Nobles, than the plebeians whom he had deserted; even his Religion lacked fervour and rejoiced in ostentation; nothing created greater scandal than his profane use of the porphyry vase, in which the people were led to believe that Pope Sylvester had cured the Emperor Constantine of his leprosy.

The jealousy and indignation of the Pope was excited by his presumption. Rienzi summoned Pope Clement and the Cardinals before his tribunal, and ordered the transference of the Papacy to Rome. But the French Pope and French Cardinals preferred the luxurious living of Avignon to the insecure residence of the capital; intrigues at the Papal Court were stimulated against Rienzi; he was accused of heresy and even of magical arts.

At Rome the Orsini and Colonna families raised the standard of rebellion, and Rienzi had neither the skill of a General nor the fortitude of a soldier. At the first breath of opposition his courage failed him. A Bull of Excommunication was fulminated against him, and on December 15 the pusillanimous Tribune, lamenting with tears the ingratitude of the people, fled from

Rome to seek an asylum amongst the Franciscan Fraticelli at Naples.

In August, A.D. 1350, he left his retirement to lay his cause before the Emperor, Charles IV., at Prague. The Pope demanded the extradition of the heretic, and rebel against the Holy See, and the Emperor sent him to Avignon, where certain death seemed to await him. Three Cardinals were appointed to try his case. But at this crisis occurred the death of Pope Clement, and the appointment of his successor divided the public interest. The charges against Rienzi were, however, fully sustained, and he was sentenced to imprisonment.

But during his absence Rome had returned to its former misery and anarchy. Rienzi was entrusted by the new Pope, Innocent VI., who thought that he would have learnt wisdom in adversity, with the task of restoring rule and order in the city. Rienzi returned, and was now appointed Senator of Rome. But he had not learnt wisdom; in fact whatever virtues he had possessed were now turned into vices, and treachery and tyranny characterised the new government. He spent his time in drinking and in riotous banquets, and he, whose moral character had previously been unimpeachable, and who had been sober and temperate, degenerated into a confirmed drunkard. The end was that, A.D. 1354, he was murdered in an insurrection of the Roman people.

To succeed Clement VI., Innocent VI. (1352—1362) had been elected by the Cardinals, nearly all of whom were Frenchmen. But the battle of Crécy had been won, A.D. 1346, by the English, to be followed by the victory of Poitiers, in which John, King of France, was taken prisoner by the English, A.D. 1356, and thus lost the influence which his predecessor had exercised over the Papacy at Avignon. Innocent was a reformer, and being left a free hand, set himself against the profligacy that reigned at Avignon, and to reform the abuses of the Papal Court and the luxurious lives of the Cardinals.

The German Emperor, Charles IV. (the *Priests' Emperor*, though he was called), also recognised the need of reform. In a Council summoned by him to Nuremberg (A.D. 1356) the *Golden Bull* was issued, by which the future elections to the Imperial throne were regulated, and which entirely ignored the interference of the Popes in the election or confirmation of the Emperors. Lewis, the predecessor of Charles, was the last Emperor against whom any Pope fulminated the excommunication of the Church; the day when any weight attached to Papal excommunications had passed away.

On the death of Innocent, a Benedictine Abbot of Marseilles, a man of high character, and, like his predecessor, inclined to reform, was elected Pope, and took the title of Urban V. (1362—1370). Yielding to the request of the Italians, he, A.D. 1368, moved back the Papal chair to Rome. There, in the next year, John Palæologus, the Eastern Emperor (1341—1391), visited him, and another attempt at the reunion of East and West was made. The Emperor desired to enlist the aid of the West in a Crusade against the Infidels; so he did homage to the Pope in St. Peter's, and expressed a desire of reunion on the basis of the Western Creed. Urban, who was desirous of meeting his wishes, invited the people of Europe to aid the Emperor against the Turks. But it was in vain, and this attempt at reunion was as ineffectual as previous ones had been. But Rome proved an insecure residence for the Pope; the Cardinals also longed after the luxuries of Avignon; and Urban, after having resided in the neighbourhood of Rome for three years, returned to Avignon, to die there shortly afterwards.

Gregory XI. (1370—1378) was the next Pope. Another attempt at reunion between East and West was made, the Eastern Church again expressing its willingness to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope. But the same stipulation, as on the previous occasion, was made by the Eastern Emperor, viz., the assistance of the Western Christians against the victorious

Infidels ; Europe was reluctant to again imperil itself in the adventure, and union between East and West was as far off as ever.

In 1377, through the influence of Catharine of Siena, the Papal throne was again transferred to Rome. Thus the Babylonish captivity, and the ignominious line of Avignonese Popes, came to an end. The Pope, however, still found Rome far from a desirable residence ; the long absence of the Popes had considerably detracted from their influence ; and a contemplated return to Avignon was only prevented by his death.

The return of the Popes to Rome was soon followed by the Great Schism in the Roman Church (1378—1471), which arose out of a disputed election of a successor to Gregory.

A large majority in the College of Cardinals were Frenchmen. To prevent their choice falling on another French Pope, the Roman populace broke in upon the conclave of Cardinals, and frightened them into electing an Italian ; and consequently, the Archbishop of Bari, a Neapolitan, was elected, and assumed the title of Urban VI. (1378—1389). Soon after his election, in order to out-number and overpower the French majority, Urban appointed twenty-eight new Cardinals to the Sacred College. But Urban's harsh and arrogant demeanour embroiled him alike with the Cardinals, the Clergy and laity ; and another Pope, the Cardinal Bishop of Cambray, was elected by the Cardinals, under the title of Clement VII. (1378—1394), who took up his residence at Avignon, Urban continuing at Rome. Thus the Great Schism of the West was caused by the Cardinals ; there were now two Popes, both acknowledged by a body of Cardinals, each anathematising the other and his adherents, so that the whole of Western Christendom rang with the anathema of the Popes, and was under the ban of one Pope or the other. France, as might be expected, and Scotland, recognised Clement ; England, Italy, and Germany, Urban.

There is little during the Schism which needs to be recorded

in the history of the Church. On the death of the first two Popes, the Cardinal of Anastasia became Pope at Rome, under the title of Boniface IX. (1389—1404); and Peter de Luna, Cardinal of Cosmedin, Pope at Avignon, under the title of Benedict XIII. (1394—1417), both being elected by the Cardinals. Benedict undertook at his election to endeavour to heal the Schism, and even, if necessary, to resign; but, as soon as he was elected, evaded his promises. Boniface was succeeded in Rome by Innocent VII. (1404—1406), a Neapolitan Cardinal, who was bound by a promise to abdicate, if it would conduce to the peace of the Church. After his short and troubled Pontificate followed a Venetian Cardinal, titular Patriarch of Constantinople, under the title of Gregory XII. (1406—1415), a man of high and unblemished character, who also bound himself to retire, if necessary. But both the Roman and Avignonese Popes succeeded in making themselves obnoxious to the Cardinals of their respective Sees; the Roman Cardinals, in disgust, left the Court of Gregory and retired to Pisa; whilst the Avignonese Pontiff took refuge in Perpignan in Spain.

Ever since the traitor-king John sold his kingdom to the Pope, England had been, as Bishop Stubbs says, the great harvest-field of papal imposition. We have seen how Germany and France had lately secured themselves against the aggressions of the Pope; we must now briefly glance at the anti-papal legislation in England during the same period ^a.

King Edward I. was succeeded by his son Edward II. (1307—1327), both intellectually and morally a weak King; and, as was generally the case under such kings, the Pope was allowed to do much as he liked, and we find no anti-papal legislation. In his reign commenced the Papal Secession to Avignon; whence Pope Clement V., to oblige the King, appointed by provision Reynolds, the son of a baker at Windsor, a sporting man,

^a See Chap. XIII.

and chiefly famous in theatrical entertainments, to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, against the nominee of the Chapter of Canterbury. John XXII., the successor of Clement, in seventeen years (1317—1334), by the system of Provisions, appointed the Bishops of sixteen English Sees, and in a similar manner usurped the presentation to numerous Benefices.

Edward II. being deposed, A.D. 1327, was succeeded by his son Edward III. (1327—1377). When, A.D. 1343, Pope Clement VI. claimed by *provision* two thousand marks annually for two Roman Cardinals, his Legates, who came to England to collect the money, were ordered out of the Kingdom, and the King wrote an indignant letter to the Pope. He reminded him how Kings and Nobles had richly endowed the Church of England; whereas now, through the system of Provisions sanctioned by the Popes, the wild boar out of the wood rooted up, and the wild beasts of the field devoured, the vineyard. The commission of the Saviour to St. Peter was, he told him, not to shear the sheep, but to feed them; to strengthen the brethren, not to depress them.

The appointment of Simon Islip (1349—1366) to the Archbishopric of Canterbury marks the commencement of a new era in the relations of England with the Popes. Pope Clement VI. in the Bull of Confirmation declared that he was appointed by *Apostolical provision*, without regard to the election of the Chapter and King (*spretâ electione factâ de eo*).

Both Clergy, except such as were the nominees of the Popes, and laity now made common cause, and as remonstrances with the Pope were of no avail, Parliament brought its weight to bear; from this time to the end of the Fourteenth Century the Statute-book abounds with anti-papal legislation, which was never repealed, but which remained the law of the land till the Reformation, and continues to be so to the present day.

In 1351 the first Statute of *Provisors* was passed against

Reservations or *Provisions* by the Popes. This was followed, A.D. 1353, by the first Statute of *Præmunire* against the jurisdiction of the Papal Court, forbidding, under the penalty of outlawry and imprisonment, causes to be taken out of England into foreign Courts. Another Act of *Præmunire* to the same effect was passed A.D. 1365.

When Pope Urban V., thinking to set these Statutes at defiance, demanded, A.D. 1365, the tribute stipulated by King John, with the arrears of thirty years, a tribute which had been refused by able Kings like Edward I. and III., the three Estates of the Realm unanimously resolved that no King had any power to act as John had done, and that the act was in violation of his Coronation-oath. The King, to mark his indignation, stopped the payment of Peter-Pence.

Meanwhile the Popes, who only regarded England in the light of a rich country, which could supply an ample pecuniary harvest, by the system of provisions and dispensations, by appointing Italians, who did not speak the English language, and never resided in England, to English Benefices, had brought the Church to the verge of ruin. We need not credit all we hear, but after leaving a wide margin for exaggeration, the condition of England and of the Church was as bad as it could be. The Friars, the allies of the Popes, were always quarrelling amongst themselves, and being freed from Episcopal jurisdiction, usurped the duties of the Parish Priests, and had become the enemies of the Church and a nuisance to society. Several Benefices were held by the same Priest, and two or three Bishoprics by the same Bishop, who were granted dispensations of non-residence. The Services were said in Latin, which the Clergy understood but little, and the laity not at all. Preaching had fallen into disuse under Clergy, who could only just read their Missals and Breviaries, and could scarcely say by heart the Lord's Prayer, the Creeds, and the Ten Commandments; who were far from patterns to their people, and, even if

they had the will, which few of them had, did not possess the gift of preaching.

The Satirist who, about A.D. 1370, wrote *Piers Ploughman's Vision*, exposes the immoral condition of society, the corruptions of the Church, and the divisions amongst the Friars. These last taught nothing, except that the Dominicans warned people against the Franciscans, the Franciscans against the Dominicans. He complains of men depriving God of the honour due to him, and of the worldly-mindedness of the Priests; whilst he asserts that the Pope is Antichrist.

A spirit of discontent reigned throughout the land, and began to vent itself against the Church. The Baronage, under John of Gaunt, threatened the Prelates, and complained of the chief offices in the State being held by Clergymen; they were Chancellors, Justiciars, diplomatists, ambassadors; and, in 1371, William of Wykeham was forced into resigning the Chancellorship. A socialistic spirit also had begun to manifest itself amongst the middle and lower classes.

A reform of the Church of England was urgently needed, and a reformer appeared in the person of John Wicliffe (circ. 1324—1384).

Born in Yorkshire, he became Fellow, and, A.D. 1361, Master of Balliol College, Oxford. In the same year he resigned the Mastership, and accepted the College Living of Fillingham in Lincolnshire. He soon, however, returned to Oxford, and, A.D. 1363, became the first Head of Canterbury Hall, which occupied the site of the present Canterbury Quadrangle of Christ Church, and had been founded two years previously as a mixed foundation of Regular and Secular Clergy. On Simon Langham (1366—1368), the successor of Islip in the See of Canterbury, who had been a Benedictine Monk, excluding the Seculars from the foundation, Wicliffe was superseded, and, A.D. 1368, exchanged the Living of Fillingham for that of Ludgershall in Buckinghamshire.

Meanwhile his fame had spread from the University to the Court, and his opinion was taken with respect to the tribute demanded by Pope Urban, and which, as mentioned above, was repudiated by the three Estates of the Realm. Wicliffe wrote a state-paper against the payment, and thenceforward was recognised as the acknowledged leader of the University.

Having taken, A.D. 1370, his D.D. degree, he was, in 1374, appointed second on a commission, which was despatched under John of Gaunt to confer with Papal representatives at Bruges on the subject of Provisions. Nothing seems to have come of it, except that Wicliffe gained a far from favourable insight into the corrupt state of the Papacy, and did not gain the good-will of the Pope.

In 1377 he was summoned by Courtney, Bishop of London, to appear before Convocation on the charge of erroneous teaching. He was accompanied by John of Gaunt, who was an especial object of dislike with the Clergy. An unseemly quarrel which occurred between Courtney and John of Gaunt, was the cause of inflicting a moral defeat upon Wicliffe. But in the following year, being in consequence of some Bulls of the Pope, summoned to appear before a Council of Bishops at Lambeth, the populace of London, which had before sided with Courtney, being aroused by the national hostility to Papal interference, now advocated the cause of Wicliffe; Wicliffe found a friend in the Princess of Wales, the mother of the young King Richard II. (1377—1399), who was virtually Regent; and further proceedings against him were forbidden.

The Great Schism of the West now commenced, in which Wicliffe declared that "Christ had cloven the head of Antichrist." He soon afterwards began his translation of the Bible, and he adopted the Bible as the sole authority in matters of faith.

From attacking the corrupt practices of the Church, he,

A.D. 1381, proceeded to the attack of the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation. Thus he opened himself to a charge of heresy, and brought upon himself the condemnation of the University. In that year also, occurred the insurrection of the peasants, under Wat Tyler, in which Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury (1375—1381), who, as Chancellor of the Kingdom, had, through the imposition of an obnoxious tax acquired unpopularity, was murdered. Sudbury and Wicliffe were friends, and the latter, so far from being in any matter, as he was accused, its author or abettor, could have felt nothing but horror and indignation at the cruel murder. But it wrecked the cause of Wicliffe; his *Poor Priests* were wrongly accused of Socialism; and all prospect of the reformation of the Church being effected under him was frustrated.

Courtney succeeded Sudbury as Archbishop of Canterbury (1381—1396). Wicliffe's enemies, the Friars, induced Courtney to summon him before a Council, in May, 1382, in the Chapter House of the Black-Friars in London. Wicliffe remarked that now "Pontius Pilate and Herod were leagued together." The Council, from an earthquake which occurred in its first Session, was known as the *Earthquake Council*; Wicliffe's writings were condemned. The Crown issued a writ for the suppression of the Wicliffites, amongst whom were the Vice-Chancellor, and both the Proctors, of Oxford. Thenceforward Lollardy (probably from *Lolium*, *tare*), as Wicliffe's teaching was called, was, to all outward appearance, suppressed at Oxford. But with it the intellectual life of the University disappeared also, and a decline in learning as well as in Religion, followed, and continued till the Renaissance in the next century.

Wicliffe was probably indebted to the Papal Schism for being allowed to retire unmolested and end his days in peace at Lutterworth, where he completed his translation of the Bible. This work, the first translation of the *whole* of the Bible which was

ever made into any modern language, was the great glory of his life ; thenceforward the Bible could never be a sealed book. It was composed at a time when learning was at a low ebb, and when the Greek language did not form part of University teaching. It was not made from the original Greek of the New Testament, nor from the Hebrew. Being therefore a translation from a translation, it has the incidental drawbacks. Still it was no mean translation, and was thought so good that the authorised version of King James I. drew largely upon it.

There was much that was good, but also some objectionable points, in Wicliffe's teaching. His great grievances were the wealth of the Church, the secularity and oppression of the Popes, the worldly-mindedness and hypocrisy of their friends, the Friars. He held that the Clergy had no right to be rich, nor even to possess endowments. He could not hold that the wicked had any place in God's Church ; and from this he deduced the erroneous opinion that the sin of the minister invalidates the work of his ministry. So that the Church has reason to rejoice that the Reformation, necessary as it was, was not effected under him. He was a man to pull down a house, not the man to build one up. He would have pulled down the Church of Rome, but have left no Catholic foundation whereon to build the superstructure.

He was summoned from his retirement at Lutterworth to appear before the Pope. The summons arrived too late. During Mass in the Church of Lutterworth he was, on December 28, A.D. 1384, seized with a stroke of paralysis, from which he died on the last day of the year.

The immediate results of Wicliffe's teaching were more apparent on the Continent than in England. Richard II. of England had married Anne of Bohemia (sister of the King Wenzel, or Wencenslaus), the *good Queen Anne*, who was a favourer of Wicliffe's doctrines. After her death, which occurred in 1394, a large number of Gospel tracts, which Wycliffe had written at

Lutterworth, were carried thither by the Ladies of her Court, and received an extensive circulation. Thus Wicliffe may be considered the forerunner, and even the author, of the German Reformation ; his opinions were eagerly caught up and circulated in Bohemia ; Wycliffe begat Huss of Bohemia, and Jerome of Prague ; Huss begat Luther, and Luther the Reformation in Germany.

In pursuance of a decree of the Council of Constance^b, on May 4, A.D. 1415, Wicliffe's bones were in 1427 disinterred from their resting-place in Lutterworth and burnt. The ashes were thrown into the River Swift, which flows by Lutterworth ; the Swift, says the late Professor Blunt of Cambridge, bore them on to the Avon, the Avon to the Severn, the Severn to the Sea, to be dispersed, like his teaching, into every country. Which thing, he adds, is an allegory.

Wicliffe's followers in England were called Lollards, some of them holding more, others less, his opinions. Under the same name was comprised a heterogeneous mass of religious and political fanatics, entirely alien from Wicliffe. This party became dangerous members of the community, both in Church and State ; with no reverence for the Church, they would have willingly pulled down the Churches and Monasteries, and confiscated the revenues of the Clergy ; and so rapidly did the Lollards grow in numbers that not many years after Wicliffe's death, they are said (doubtless with great exaggeration) to have constituted the half of England.

In the reign of Richard II. fresh Statutes of *Provisors* and *Præmunire* were enacted against the Court of Rome. In 1390 a new and more stringent Statute of *Provisors* was passed, against which Courtney, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Arundel of York, doubtless thinking that the former Statute went far enough, entered a protest.

But the new Statute of *Præmunire*, A.D. 1393, met the approval

^b See below in this Chapter.

of both the Archbishops, as well as of the Bishops. It forbade all attempts to procure "at Rome, or elsewhere, any translations, processes, Bulls, instruments, or other things, which touch the King, against him, his Crown, and Realm." On the deposition of Richard, A.D. 1399, Parliament declared that the rights of the Crown had been at all times so free, that neither Pope nor any external power had any right to interfere with the same.

Arundel (1396—1414), who succeeded Courtney as Archbishop of Canterbury, was a bitter opponent of the Lollards. In 1401 the Statute *de hæretico Comburendo* was passed, by which they were subjected to the extreme penalties of the law. In 1408 the Schism in the Papacy was brought before Convocation assembled under Arundel ; and both Houses, as well as the two Houses of Parliament, signified to the Pope and Cardinals that no more money should be sent to Rome from England until the Schism was healed.

No unprejudiced reader of Ecclesiastical history can believe that, from the time of John to the beginning of the Fifteenth Century, the period at which we have now arrived, either Church or State in England ever acquiesced in, or submitted without protest to, the Pope's usurped jurisdiction.

At the opening of the Fifteenth Century Western Christendom was still scandalized by the Papal Schism. But it now engrossed the attention of the Princes of Europe, and the three great powers, England, France, and Germany, were at one as to the necessity of effecting a reform. But the difficulty was as to the mode of effecting it. Three alternative plans presented themselves ; to induce one or other of the schismatical Popes to abdicate ; or to induce them to consent to an arbitration ; or to call a General Council.

France had taken the initiative. The University of Paris enjoyed at the time a high reputation amongst the Universities of Europe, first under its Chancellor, Peter d'Ailly, who was considered the first Theologian of the day, and his still more famous successor, Gerson.

Peter d'Ailly held that the sole Head of the Church is Christ, and that the unity of the Church consists in being in union with Christ, and not necessarily in union with the Pope. Such also was the teaching of Gerson.

Gerson, born A.D. 1363, of a family strictly devoted to the Papacy, three of his brothers being monks, was, like Grosseteste in England, a firm advocate of the rights of the Popes, but their equally strong opponent when they were wrong. His views with regard to the Papacy were not less advanced than those of Wicliffe. Who is the Pope? he asks. He is a man, the son of a man, and liable to sin. If he does sin, all partake in his guilt, and he ought to be deposed. The Decretals and Clementines he appraises at their just value; "the Canons on which the authority of the Popes is based were framed by fraud and deceit."

At the instigation of the University, and after a national Council held in Paris, A.D. 1395, a mission was sent to Avignon, but failed in its purpose of persuading Pope Benedict to abdicate. Again, A.D. 1398, Peter d'Ailly, who had become Bishop of Cambrai, was despatched on a similar errand, but with no greater success, both to Rome and Avignon. France thereupon withdrew its allegiance from Benedict, and detained him as a prisoner at Avignon until A.D. 1403, when he contrived to make his escape, and having made some influential friends, was once more acknowledged by France as Pope. But Benedict again offended France by breaking the promises he had made, and on which he had been re-instated; whereupon, in June, 1406, Parliament resolved, and the King issued an edict, which was one foundation of the Gallican Liberties, that the Gallican Church should be for ever free from all claims unduly introduced by the Roman Church.

The Cardinals of both parties of the Papacy were now thoroughly weary of the interminable contest, and determined to put an end to the schism of which they themselves had been

the original cause. Having come to an agreement amongst themselves, and having been unsuccessful in the attempts to induce the rival Popes to abdicate ; feeling certain that they would never consent to arbitration, they fell back on the third alternative, that of General Councils, to which, according to the Canons of the Primitive Church, the Popes were subject, and the Cardinals issued from Pisa a summons for a General Council to meet in that city, in March, 1409.

The Council accordingly met on Lady Day of that year. The summoning of the Council was a recognition by the Cardinals that the Popes were subordinate to General Councils, and that it was not essential that Councils should be summoned by Popes. Besides twenty-two Cardinals, the Council was attended by twelve Archbishops, and, in person or by proxy, about two hundred Bishops and three hundred Abbots ; by a deputation from England under Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, amongst whom was Chichely, Bishop of St. David's, afterwards (1414—1443) Archbishop of Canterbury ; by delegates from thirteen Universities, including those of Paris, Oxford, and Cambridge ; by ambassadors from all the Kings and ruling Princes of Europe, with the exception of Spain ; in all by about a thousand members.

The two Popes were cited to appear, and on their non-appearance were pronounced contumacious, and deposed. A Franciscan Friar, a Cardinal of Milan, an aged man more than seventy years of age, was then elected Pope, and took the title of Alexander V. (1409—1410) ; the Council was dissolved on August 7. On the death of Alexander, after a Pontificate of ten months, John XXIII. (1410—1415), a Neapolitan, was elected by the Cardinals. The new Pope, who had been a Pirate, was accused of having murdered his predecessor, and brought with him into the Papacy all the profligacy which had marked his former disgraceful life. The deposed Popes refusing to resign, there were now three Popes,

so that matters were rendered worse, instead of better, by the Council.

Sigismund, who was now Emperor of Germany (1410—1438), and, at a time when England and France were engaged in war, the most powerful ruler in Europe, resolved to terminate the schism of the Church, and to effect the reformation of the Clergy. There was no help for the Pope but to acquiesce in the determination of the Emperor to summon another Council; and in compliance with the wishes of the Emperor, and much to the annoyance of the Pope, who had to cross the Alps into German territory, Constance was selected as the place of meeting.

The Council of Constance, which was attended by representatives of all the Western Kingdoms; by twenty-six Princes, one hundred and fifty Counts; five Patriarchs; twenty-four Cardinals; ninety-one Bishops; six hundred Abbots and Doctors; and about four thousand other Clergy; met on November, 1414, and continued its Sessions till 1418. Hallam again, with the Bishops of Bath and Hereford, attended from England. The Pope, John XXIII., whom Cosmo de Medici^c attended to Constance, assumed the Presidency, until the arrival of the Emperor Sigismund on Christmas Day; the learned Peter d'Ailly preached the sermon, in which he referred to the Council of Jerusalem, and spoke of the superiority of Councils over Popes. On May 29, 1415, the still more learned Gerson joined the French Bishops.

The Council divided itself into four national sections, those of England, Germany, France, and Italy. The plan adopted was for each section to deliberate on each question separately, and when an agreement was arrived at, to hold a general Session, which gave sanction and validity to the decrees of the Council.

On May 29 the Council formally deposed the Pope, John XXIII., on account of his wickedness and crimes. The other Roman Pope, Gregory XII., died in 1415. Benedict XIII., the

^c See p. 537.

Avignonese Pope, remained intractable. On November 11, 1417, a noble Roman Cardinal, Otto di Colonna, was elected Pope by the Council, and took the title of Martin V. (1417—1431), and was acknowledged by the whole of Europe. Shortly afterwards Benedict XIII. died, and Martin was left in undisturbed possession of the Roman Pontificate.

John XXIII., the deposed Pope, had endeavoured to make his escape from Constance, but was captured by the Duke of Bavaria. Cosmo de' Medici however liberated him by the payment of a large ransom, and gave him a refuge for life in his Palace at Florence; at his request Pope Martin created him a Cardinal, an honour which he did not long enjoy, dying A.D. 1419.

Thus the Roman Schism was healed, but no reform of the Church was effected, and the Papal pretensions remained as high, and became even higher than before. So far from a reform of the Church being made, a decree was passed on June 14, 1415, that the Eucharist should be administered to the laity in One form only, that of Bread.

In May, Wicliffe and his doctrines had been condemned. On July 6 John Huss (1373—1416), a native of Hussinetz in Bohemia, and Rector of the University of Prague, who had come to the Council under a safe-conduct of the Emperor Sigismund, was burnt, by order of the Council, outside the walls of Constance. Like Wicliffe, he had before attacked the corruptions of the Clergy; and now he appealed to the Scriptures as superior to Councils, and condemned the novel decree of the Council of Constance as to Communion in One kind, as opposed to the plain words of Christ and St. Paul. Though holding true Catholic doctrine, he was condemned as an incorrigible heretic, the Emperor Sigismund himself, to his lasting shame, joining in the condemnation; and even Gerson, although a strong reformer, insisted on obedience to the authority of the Council.

Jerome of Prague, the friend of Huss, in whose opinions he shared, had followed him to Constance. The Council, after

many endeavours, succeeded, on September 10, A.D. 1415, in inducing him to recant his opinions. In February, 1416, fresh proceedings were commenced against him, and he then retracted his abjuration. On May 30, chanting on the road to execution the Creed and the Litany, he met his death with fortitude, and even cheerfulness.

The treacherous execution of Huss excited the greatest indignation in Bohemia, and led, A.D. 1415, to a merciless religious war, which lasted for fifteen years, not only in that, but throughout the neighbouring countries, during which the denial of the Cup to the laity was the chief cause of contention. The advocates for Communion in Both Kinds, hence called Utraquists (*sub utraque Specie*), and Calixtines (*calix*, cup), found an able leader in the *one-eyed* Ziska; and the most fearful atrocities were committed both by the so-called orthodox, and the Hussites, the latter ruthlessly slaying not only the Priests and Monks, who were the objects of their hatred on account of the execution of Huss, but also the inoffensive peasants, and destroying churches and convents.

All the resources of the Empire were taxed in vain to quell the insurrection. Ziska died of the plague, A.D. 1424. But the Hussites had become divided into two parties, the one the Calixtines, or followers of Huss, the other the Taborites, a fanatical sect, which derived its name from Tabor, a mountain in Bohemia, on which, at the commencement of the contest, they had erected a fortified camp; this party demanded a further reformation in the direction of what they considered Apostolical simplicity. At length a reconciliation with the Calixtines was brought about, A.D. 1433, by the Council of Basle, on the condition of their being allowed the Cup in the Eucharist. The Taborites refusing to be bound by this agreement between the orthodox party and the Calixtines, continued for twenty years longer, when they were suppressed by the Bohemian Government, still refusing, however, to follow the Roman Church.

Eventually they were merged into the peaceful community of the Bohemian, or Moravian, brethren, who arose A.D. 1457.

The Council of Constance thought to establish the independence of National Churches. Martin, more than any of his predecessors, established the rule, which his successors till the Reformation carried out, of the subjection of all Metropolitan Churches to the See of Rome, and he may be regarded as the founder of modern Ultramontanism. A new era commenced for the Church of England. Nothing so much excited his wrath as the Statute of *Præmunire*. He prevailed over the gentle spirit of Chichely, Archbishop of Canterbury, to try to procure its abolition, but Parliament remained firm, and neither then nor ever afterwards was the obnoxious statute repealed. Martin inaugurated the system of appointing an English Prelate as a residential Cardinal in England, to watch over the Church. What he failed to effect under a powerful King like Henry V., he effected under the weak Henry VI.; and in May, 1426, Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester, second son of John of Gaunt, was appointed Cardinal over the head of Chichely. Thus a step was taken towards denationalising the Church of England, of weakening the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and exalting that of the Pope.

Pope Martin died on February 21, A.D. 1431. The Cardinals pledged themselves that whoever of their number was chosen Pope should proceed on a reform of the Court of Rome in its Head and branches; and the Cardinal of Siena was elected under the title of Eugenius IV. (1431—1439). He at once showed an aversion to a reformation of the Church, or any diminution of his prerogatives. A third Council met at Basle, on July 23 of the year of his election, and continued its Sessions from 1431—1439; its proposed objects being to effect the reunion between East and West, and the reformation of the Church in its Head and members. The Pope did all in his power to discredit the Council. Objecting to its being held out of Italy, he held two

Councils of his own, the first at Ferrara, which, when the plague made its appearance in that city, he transferred in the following year to Florence. Here not only the Pope and several Cardinals met, but the Greek Patriarch, with his Metropolitans, and John Palæologus, Emperor of the East, in person, with the view of promoting the reunion of the Churches, attended. The proposed reunion was for a time effected, and the Pope acknowledged to be the legitimate successor of St. Peter. The Emperor, however, was disappointed of the aid which he had expected against the Turks; the Eastern Church refused to ratify the agreement; and even those, who had at the Council acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope, publicly retracted it at Constantinople.

Meanwhile the Council of Basle continued its Sessions, and reaffirmed the principle acted on in the two previous Councils, of the supremacy of Councils over Popes. In 1439 it deposed Eugenius and elected in his place Amadeus of Savoy, who took the title of Felix V. (1439—1449). So that Rome had again a Pope and an Antipope. But Europe was by that time thoroughly tired out with the contentions and schisms in the Papacy, and Eugenius was allowed to regain possession of his See. The Council of Basle was discredited, and dissolved without any good being effected by it; although, had its decrees been followed, the power of the Popes would have been curbed, and the rights of National Churches established.

The differences between the Pope and the Council of Basle led to action being taken, in their own interest, by France and Germany; the conciliar movement having failed, the rights of National Churches must be asserted in some other manner. France, impoverished by her long war with England, took a practical view of the matter and determined to protect itself against Papal exactions. Accordingly after a Synod at Bourges, A.D. 1438, Charles VII. issued the *Pragmatic Sanction*, which formed the basis of the Liberties of the Gallican Church. It embodied some

important decisions of the Council against the usurpations of the Popes in the appointment of Bishops ; against Expectatives and Reservations, and the payment of Annates and First-fruits, and against Appeals to Rome. Twenty years later, Louis XI., in order to oblige Pope Pius II., cancelled this document, but on a subsequent quarrel with the Pope re-enacted it, and it continued in force till the substitution in its place of the famous Concordat, A.D. 1516, between Francis I. and Pope Leo X. The Concordat, however, gave a practical advantage to the Pope ; for, although it assigned the nomination to Bishoprics to the Kings of France, yet, as it assigned no time for institution, the Pope could postpone it indefinitely.

The *Pragmatic Sanction* between Germany and the Pope was agreed to in the following year. At a Diet at Maintz in March, free election to German Bishoprics was provided for, after which the Pope was not to refuse confirmation ; a limitation also was put on Appeals to Rome, and Papal Excommunications.

The system of governing the Church of England by Roman Cardinals, which had been inaugurated by Martin V., was continued by Eugenius and his successors till the Reformation. In 1439, Kemp, Archbishop of York, was appointed Cardinal, over Chichely, the Archbishop of Canterbury. John Stratford (1443—1452) succeeded Chichely as Archbishop, and on his death Kemp became Archbishop of Canterbury (1452—1454) under Pope Nicholas V. (1447—1454), and was not only a Cardinal but the Pope's Legate à latere. Thomas Bourchier (1454—1486), the next Archbishop of Canterbury, was, A.D. 1465, appointed a Cardinal, as was also his successor, John Morton (1486—1500). Henry Dean (1501—1503) was Papal Legate.

Thus the Archbishops were as much Romanists, and did the work of the Pope in England as effectually, as Roman Bishops in any other country ; the Nationality of the Church was for a time destroyed, and the English Bishops became the adherents and the tools of the Popes of Rome.

The period between 1455—1485 was taken up with the Wars of the Roses, and was one of the most disastrous in English history. The thoughts of Parliament and the Nation were too much concentrated on the civil condition of the country to allow of attention being given to the interests of the Church, and so the Popes were left with a freer hand than they ever before had in England.

Meanwhile great changes were taking place which altered the whole aspect of the world and the conditions of society, and announced the approach of more enlightened times. The Fifteenth Century witnessed in its progress a series of events, unparalleled perhaps, certainly unsurpassed, in an equal space of time, in the World's history. The invention of printing by Gutenberg at Maintz, A.D. 1452, and the discovery, a few years earlier, of the art of making paper from linen ; and, with respect to England, the introduction by Caxton into this Country of the printing press, A.D. 1476 ; to which must be added the invention of gunpowder, making as important a change in war as the art of printing did in peace ; showed that old things were passing away, and that a new era was inaugurated.

In the last years of the Century, England, Portugal, Spain, France and Holland, began to make settlements in hitherto unknown parts of the world. In 1492 Christopher Columbus, a native of Genoa, sailing in Spanish vessels, in the service of Ferdinand and Isabella^d, discovered the lands which came to be known as the West Indies ; one of the first of which he called Hispaniola or *New Spain*, now St. Domingo or Hayti. Other voyages he undertook between 1493—1502 ; and to him the world is indebted for the discovery of San Salvador, Cuba, Dominica, Antigua, Jamaica, Trinidad, and several Islands on the Coast of Honduras.

In 1497 Sebastian Cabot, a Venetian in the service of Henry VII. of England, proceeding further to the North, first

^d See next Chapter.

discovered North America ; Christopher Columbus landed there in 1498, but the country took its name from a third Italian, Americo Vespucci, who was supposed to have reached the Country before Columbus.

The discovery in 1497 of the Cape of Good Hope, and of a new passage to India and the far East, by Vasco da Gama, brought Western Christendom into a more direct communication than existed before with the ancient Churches of the East.

On May 29, A.D. 1453, the Christian world had been startled by a disaster of appalling magnitude, the fall of Constantinople under the arms of the victorious Turks. Thus the extinction of the Eastern Empire was effected. The city of Constantine the Great fell into the hands of the Infidels, and the Christian Temple of St. Sophia, the Metropolitan Cathedral of the East, built by Constantine to commemorate the Wisdom of God, the Second Person in the Trinity, was converted into a heathen Mosque ; and the Eastern Church reeled under a blow from which it has never recovered.

In vain the Popes endeavoured to stir up Europe for a Crusade ; they no longer possessed the confidence or respect of Christendom. The reigning Pope, Nicholas V., made the fruitless attempt, and shame and sorrow at the fall of Constantinople are said to have accelerated his death. Calixtus II. (1455—1458) met with no better success. Pius II. (1458—1464) assembled, A.D. 1459, a Council at Mantua for the purpose, and he too died of a broken heart, because he could not induce the Church to join him. That the Church of England was not insensible of the danger that beset Christendom, we have evidence in one of the Collects for Good Friday, composed in the Primacy of Archbishop Bourchier, for the conversion of Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics. But when, A.D. 1464, it was rumoured that the Pope was trying to collect money in England for a Crusade, the Nation, too

often deceived by the Popes to trust them any longer, fell back upon the Statutes of Provisors and Præmunire, and the Government forbade any public fund to be raised in the country.

But good, in a manner little to be expected, came out of evil. The immediate result of the fall of Constantinople was the restoration, after a long abeyance, of the Greek language (the original language of the New Testament), first into Italy, and then from Italy into other countries of Europe.

Italy was at that time the leading country in Europe in art and literature. The general degradation of learning which had followed after the time of the celebrated triumvirate, Dante (1265—1321), Boccaccio (1313—1375), and Petrarch (1304—1374), had begun to disappear in the first half of the Fifteenth Century. Amongst the independent Commonwealths of Italy, Florence was, under the leadership of the family of the Medici, the centre of the intellectual life of the country. Chief amongst them were Giovanni (died 1428), but more especially his son Cosmo (1389—1464), to whom his grateful country gave the name of *Pater Patriæ*; and his grandson Lorenzo (1448—1492), *the Magnificent*, father of Giovanni de' Medici, who, having been raised to the Cardinalate when he was only thirteen years of age, was afterwards Pope, under the title of Leo X.; all of whom were eminent and liberal patrons of learning.

Cosmo, at a great cost, collected many ancient and valuable MSS. in Hebrew, Greek, Chaldaic, and Arabic, with which he laid the foundation in Florence of two valuable libraries, which were afterwards greatly added to by his grandson Lorenzo, and which exist to the present day, the Bibliotheca Laurentiana, and the Bibliotheca Marciana, the latter being in the monastery of St. Mark. In making the latter collection, he had the valuable assistance of Tomaso Parentucchi, who was born at Pisa, A.D. 1398, the son of a poor physician at Sarzana, an indefatigable student, and intimately acquainted with Greek and Latin, who was at the time in the minor Orders of the Church.

In 1443 Tomaso was consecrated Bishop of Bologna, and four years afterwards, at a time when Humanism was exerting a strong influence in Italy, was, from his reputation for learning, elected Pope under the title of Nicolas V.

Rome had received an intellectual stimulus from Florence. Pope Eugenius IV., a Venetian of a good and wealthy family, had, before he took Orders, bestowed twenty thousand ducats on charitable institutions; and after his elevation to the Papacy, though his tastes were monastic rather than humanistic, became a liberal and substantial supporter of scholars in Rome.

Nicolas V., after he became Pope, was a noble and munificent patron of the New Learning; and conferred a permanent benefit on Humanism. The library of his predecessors, scanty at the best, having been either destroyed or dispersed during the migration of the Popes at Avignon, Nicolas succeeded before his death in collecting, at the cost of forty thousand scudi, five thousand volumes of Greek and Roman authors, and thus became the real founder of the Vatican Library at Rome.

It was about this time that the art of Printing was discovered, and the fall of Constantinople occurred. A goodly number of Greek Scholars had been brought to Florence by the Council which was held in that City by Pope Eugenius IV., for the reconciliation of the Eastern and Western Churches. But after the fall of Constantinople, a further influx into Italy of learned scholars, bringing with them their valuable Greek MSS., occurred; they met with an enthusiastic reception from Cosmo in Florence and Pope Nicolas in Rome, and under Nicolas, Humanism became the surest road to ecclesiastical and political honours. Public Schools for the study of Greek were instituted at Florence; the discovery of printing gave it a stimulus, and the New Learning rapidly spread throughout other cities in Italy. The study of Plato was revived in Cosmo's house by a Greek fugitive. He himself instituted the Platonic Academy for the culture of Platonism, which was in vogue with the Greek Scholars, and again super-

seded the Philosophy of Aristotle. This famous academy acquired greater strength and renown under Lorenzo.

Florence thus became the cradle and centre of the New Learning, and the Greek language, the golden key by which that learning was to be unlocked, the numerous errors of the Vulgate exposed, and the original and true meaning of the Bible brought to light.

Lorenzo the Magnificent was a still greater patron of learned men than his grandfather Cosmo. But this being said, there is little more to be told in his favour. In Florence, under his rule, the revival of classical literature (*humanism*, or the culture of humanity, as it was called) was universal, and the city assumed an outward aspect of peace and prosperity. But, under the shameless profligacy which he himself exhibited, both in his public and private life, the city sunk into a deep state of corruption; almost every one, man or woman, could speak Greek; but men of letters, statesmen, nobles, peasants, every class of society, were largely devoid of public and private virtue, and wanting in every moral principle. There the Religion, if we may so describe it, of the Renaissance, consisted in an indifference to religion; without faith of any kind; a denial or depreciation of revelation and of the services of the Church, and even such religion as existed, philosophical and sceptical as it was, was treated with ridicule and contempt.

A reformer arose in Florence in the person of Fra Girolamo Savonarola (1452—1498), a native of Ferrara, who became Prior of St. Mark's in Florence; he foretold the doom which hung over their city, and exhorted them to repentance. Of Savonarola, Lorenzo said, "I know no honest monk but this one," and he summoned him to attend his death-bed at Careggi. Savonarola, though much surprised at the summons, and confessing that nothing which he could say would be acceptable, went; Lorenzo refused the conditions which he imposed, and angrily turned his back upon him; Savonarola left without granting him

absolution, and soon afterwards Lorenzo the Magnificent, torn by remorse, died.

Cardinal Bessarion, who enjoyed a high reputation for learning, would have proved a worthy successor of Nicolas. He had been baptized into the Greek Church, in which he had risen to a high station, and attended the Council of Florence as Archbishop of Nice. He was induced to join the Roman Communion; and Eugenius IV. created him a Cardinal. It seemed at one time that he was likely to be elected as the successor of Nicolas; objections, however, were raised against him on the ground of his being a Greek, and not having shaved off his beard; and a Spanish Cardinal, Alfonso Borgia, an old man, seventy-seven years of age, was elected under the title of Calixtus III. (1455—1458). His Pontificate, which was a violent reaction from that of Nicolas, was not, unless we except his attempt to promote a crusade, distinguished by any remarkable event, beyond his nepotism.

The next Pope was Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, who took the title of Pius II. (1458—1464), a Pope second only to Nicolas V. as an encourager of learning. At the Council of Basle he had stood forward as the strong opponent of Papal usurpations, and maintained that Popes were subordinate to General Councils; he was promoted to the rank of Cardinal by Calixtus; but no sooner did he become Pope than he exhibited a remarkable instance of inconsistency, advocating the various errors which he had abjured at Basle, and asserting the highest claims for the Papacy. As Æneas Sylvius, he said, he had been a heretic, but as Pope he had become orthodox. Nevertheless his due meed must be assigned to him as a patron of learning. He assembled a Council at Mantua, A.D. 1459, in hopes of promoting a Crusade against the Turks, and is said to have attempted to convert Mahomet.

Peter Barbo, a Venetian Cardinal, a nephew of Pope Eugenius, was next elected. A man fond of display, and priding himself on

his tall and handsome appearance, he proposed to take the title of Formosus ; but when this was objected to by the Cardinals, he became Pope under the title of Paul II. (1464—1471). He showed himself, if in some respects a favourer of the Renaissance, the opponent of literature, and persecutor of the men of learning, who took up their residence in Rome during his Pontificate. He it was, Platina tells us, who instituted the Roman Carnival. He imprisoned the historian Platina for daring to hint in his presence at a General Council. As to his character, a wide divergence of opinion exists, some praising, others casting grave imputations upon him. Platina, who survived him, and was appointed librarian by the next Pope, Sixtus IV., has little to say in his favour.

Under the three successors of Paul, the Papacy again fell into the lowest depths of degradation, and the dark age of the Popes of the Tenth Century seemed to have revived.

Cardinal Francesco della Rovere, a Franciscan monk, the son of a poor peasant, succeeded as Sixtus IV. (1471—1484). Before his election he had borne a high character for learning and morality, but afterwards signalized himself as one of the most profligate in the catalogue of Popes. He, like his predecessors, tried to promote a Crusade, but, like them, was unsuccessful. He enjoyed an unenviable notoriety for nepotism ; openly sold Benefices and Bishoprics, without regard to the character of the purchaser, to the highest bidders ; and promoted two of his so-called nephews to the Cardinalate. These were Julian Rovere and Peter Riario, who, having been Franciscans, had thrown off their obligations ; the former became Pope Julius II. ; the latter with his brother Jerome were supposed to be illegitimate sons of Sixtus, by whom Peter was appointed Archbishop of Florence, and titular Patriarch of Constantinople, but died from the effects of his debauchery at the age of twenty-eight years.

Sixtus was succeeded by Innocent VIII. (1484—1492), who

was even more distinguished than his predecessor for his profligacy and simony, and enriched his seven illegitimate children out of the Papal revenues. It cannot be wondered that such a man was equally unsuccessful as his predecessors in his attempt at a Crusade.

The College of Cardinals had now grown so corrupt that, apprehensive of having a strict Pope placed over them, they elected the wickedest of their number, Roderic Borgia, who, by means of bribery, induced all but five out of the Sacred College to vote for him, and took the name of Alexander VI. (1492—1503). A stranger to every religious principle, and even to outward decency, he is generally supposed to possess amongst the Popes the pre-eminence of wickedness; the Nero of the Popes, as Mosheim calls him. Cæsar Borgia, his illegitimate son, was said to have even exceeded his father, if that were possible, in wickedness; and it is supposed that the Pope died from inadvertently drinking wine, which his son had mixed with poison for a rich Cardinal, whose wealth he coveted.

In May, 1497, the wicked Pope excommunicated the pious, if somewhat eccentric, reformer, Savonarola, who, by order of the same Pope, was with two of his followers first strangled and then burnt, in May, 1498, in the great Piazza of Florence.

His successor, Pius III., was Pope for only twenty-six days. Then followed Julian Rovere as Julius II. (1503—1512). He obtained the Papacy by bribery and corruption, and bound himself by an oath, which he never kept and never intended to keep, to summon a Council for the reformation of the Church. Being a man of warlike propensities, his Pontificate, which was almost wholly devoted to military pursuits, greatly added to the dominion of the Popes, but he cared nothing for the Church; and his military propensities, added to his many vices, rendered his Pontificate scarcely less odious than that of Alexander VI. It was this Pope, Julius, who licensed the marriage of King Henry VIII. with his brother's widow, Katharine of Arragon.

In 1511 some of the Cardinals who were opposed to Julius summoned a Council to Pisa (which was afterwards transferred to Mantua), before which they summoned him, and on his non-appearance, suspended him for contumacy ; Julius, in a Lateran Council, A.D. 1512, pronounced the Cardinals to be guilty of schism.

Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici, the son of Lorenzo the Magnificent, succeeded at the age of thirty-eight, under the title of Leo X. (1513—1521), a man more peaceful than his predecessor, with a taste for literature and art, but whose wordliness and irreligion rendered him scarcely less injurious to the Church. The subject of reform was brought before the Lateran Council, which reassembled after the death of his predecessor, but was soon dropped ; and the Council was dissolved on March 16, A.D. 1517. To what a state of unbelief the Church in Italy had fallen may be judged from Pope Leo's having to maintain before the Council the doctrine of the individual immortality of the soul. The conciliar movement had failed, and was abandoned ; and the reformation of the Church must be effected by other means.

Humanism assumed in England a more religious and practical character than in Italy. An impetus to learning had been given by the development of the Collegiate System, and the foundation, in the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Centuries, of many colleges at the two Universities. To these must be added the foundation of the great public schools of Winchester, by William of Wykeham, A.D. 1382 ; and of Eton, A.D. 1441, by King Henry VI. Scholasticism still formed the staple of education, and notwithstanding the development of the public school and collegiate system, learning was still at a low ebb ; a slight knowledge of bad Latin, and an almost complete ignorance of Greek, prevailing.

The supplanting of Scholasticism by Humanism, in England, is mainly due to three Englishmen, Grocyn, Linacre, and Colet ; and to the celebrated Erasmus. No sooner were the Wars of the

Roses ended, than students from England made their way to Italy with the view of learning the Greek language from the Italian teachers. Of this party, amongst the first were Grocyn and Linacre, whose visit extended from 1485—1491. In 1493 Colet, who had just completed his academical course at Oxford, went to Italy, with the exclusive object of studying the Greek language with the view of discovering the original sense of the New Testament. There he devoted himself entirely to Theology, and to study of the Fathers, especially Origen, and SS. Ambrose, Cyprian, and Jerome. He returned, however, untainted with the semi-infidelity which was so prevalent on the Continent, and determined not to take his stand on the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages, but on the Catholic teaching of the Bible as interpreted by the Church. Grocyn and Linacre had, in a series of lectures, already introduced the study of Greek into Oxford. Colet, between 1497—1504, delivered gratuitously before the University a series of lectures on St. Paul's Epistles, which were attended not only by Undergraduates, but Doctors and dignitaries of the Church; not only by seekers after the New, but by bigots of the Old, Learning, who looked upon the Greek language as an almost heretical exposition of the New Testament. Young students who sought his advice, he would recommend to confine themselves to the Bible and the Apostles' Creed.

A short account must here be given of Erasmus, the Father, as he has been termed, of Classical studies in England, who stands out as one of the most remarkable figures of the age preceding the Reformation, of which he was the unconscious promoter.

Desiderius Erasmus (1467—1536) was a native of Rotterdam; his paternal name was Gerard, which signifies in Dutch, beloved, and was translated into the equivalent in Latin, Desiderius, and in Greek, Erasmus. At nine years of age he was sent to the school of Deventer under the *Brothers of the Common Life*, where

one of his fellow-pupils was the future Pope, Hadrian VI., a native of Utrecht. Left an orphan at the age of thirteen, he was, at the age of eighteen, forced by his guardians to take the vows of a monk in the Augustinian Monastery at Stein. But he felt no call for the monastic life, and learnt thus early that religion is least regarded in *religious* houses; and after spending there five miserable years, he was released from his position by the Bishop of Cambray, with the consent of the Bishop of Utrecht, in whose Diocese Stein was situated, and was by the latter ordained Priest in 1492. Being by that time an accomplished Latin Scholar, but knowing little of Greek, he was sent by the Bishop of Cambray to complete his education at the University of Paris. There, in order to obtain means of supporting himself, he combined with his own studies work with private pupils, one of whom was Lord Mountjoy, with whom he contracted a life-long friendship, and who afterwards bestowed on him an annual pension of one hundred crowns; and by his invitation he came to England in 1498, being then thirty-one years of age, where he made the acquaintance of More, the future Chancellor of England. In the Spring he went to Oxford, where the Scholastic Trivium and Quadrivium still formed the curriculum of study; there he found Linacre, and Grocyn, under whom he studied Greek, lecturing, and was brought under the influence of Colet. At Oxford he met with all that he wanted, so that he could write to a friend, that he had found so much learning and culture, and that of no common kind, but exact and ancient, both Latin and Greek, that now he had no wish to go to Italy, except to see it. "When I listen," he said, "to my friend Colet, I can fancy I am listening to Plato. Who can but admire Grocyn, who is nothing short of a complete encyclopædia of knowledge? Did ever any one possess such taste, so acute and polished, as Linacre? Has nature ever produced a gentler, sweeter, and more gifted mind than that of Thomas More?"

Colet tried in vain to induce him to remain, and give a course of lectures in Oxford, but he had gone there to learn and not to teach ; so leaving Oxford he again went to Paris, in 1499, returning, however, on another short visit to England, in 1505. He then made the acquaintance of Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, whom he frequently speaks of as his Mæcenas, and describes as "a Theologian, not in name but in reality." He also made at this time the acquaintance of Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, "a man of profound learning ; . . . with whom there is no one of this age that can be compared, either for integrity of life, or for learning, or for greatness of mind, Canterbury being the only exception."

Meanwhile Colet had, A.D. 1504, been appointed Dean of St. Paul's, where he continued the teaching which he had begun at Oxford, and soon proved himself the first preacher of the day. But the New Learning at first met with far from a favourable reception in London, and Fitz-James, the Bishop, a narrow-minded Scotist, as well as many of the Clergy, considered his teaching heretical, and represented it to Warham, who, however, was a favourer of the New Learning, and gave judgment in Colet's favour.

In 1506 Erasmus was enabled by the generosity of Warham to go to Italy, where he remained three years. In Italy the Renaissance was, as we have seen, the New Birth of Paganism and worldly-mindedness. Erasmus saw Pope Julius II., dressed as a warrior, leading his troops into Bologna ; and witnessed such a general mockery of Episcopacy, as was altogether alien to his feelings, and made Italy uncongenial to the mind of the peaceful and quiet scholar. At Rome he obtained from Julius II. an exemption, which was confirmed by Leo X., from wearing his monastic dress ; many attempts were made to detain him, and there is little doubt that he would have risen to a high position in the Church of Rome. This was his first and last visit to Rome ; and at the request of Lord Mountjoy, he re-

turned to England in July of 1509, just at the time when Henry VIII., who professed himself a favourer of the New Learning, ascended the throne; and took up his residence in More's house.

Here he wrote, the most famous of his works, his satire, the *Encomium Morię*, or *Praise of Folly* (*μωρίας ἐγκώμιον*), not without a play on More's name which he wondered could be associated with a Greek word which signifies *Fool*. The object of the work was to attack the corruptions of the Church and Clergy generally, not sparing even the Pope; and the monks in particular. Folly personified sounds her own praises, and declares that mankind are indebted to her for their happiness. From her own praises, she turns off to denounce the follies existing in the world, and after having attacked other classes, she vents her denunciation especially against the monks and Theologians. The tenets of the Stoics, she says, are natural and intelligible, compared with the subtleties of Theologians, which are rendered more subtle by the teaching of the Schoolmen, Realists, Nominalists, Thomists, Albertists, Occamists, Scotists; and are so abstruse that the Apostles themselves would need a further outpouring of the Spirit to be able to meet them in controversy.

He then turns upon the monks, who arrogate to themselves the further title of *religious*, whilst they are neither. A large number of them, he says, have no claim to the latter title; and they are so thick as to be met with at every turn, whereas the word *monk* means solitary. Ignorance they consider a mark of piety; they are unable to read, and bray out the Psalms like so many jack-asses. They profess to imitate the Apostles; they make a profit out of dirt and mendicity, and are in reality filthy, vulgar, impudent vagabonds.

The preachers next undergo the lash, with their contortions of countenance, and their affectation. Nor are the Cardinals nor the Vicegerents of Christ spared. Instead of imitating the life of

Christ, His poverty, and toil, and Cross, they leave all the work to Peter and Paul, and think only of pleasures of life, and the pomp of office.

The work was overdrawn, and also to a certain extent unjust ; but it was received with immense favour amongst the great ; Kings, Bishops, Cardinals, even Pope Leo X. himself, were delighted with it ; it soon ran through several editions, and was translated into most European languages, and was imported into Germany at the time when the monk Tetzels^e was hawking Indulgences in the streets of Saxony.

Having refused the valuable Living of Aldington, which was offered him by Warham, and accepting a pension in lieu of it, he, at the invitation of Fisher, the pious Bishop of Rochester, and Chancellor of the University, who was thoroughly in sympathy with the new Learning, went to teach at Cambridge, and, through Fisher's influence he was, A.D. 1511, appointed to the Margaret Professorship of Divinity, which, as well as the Professorship which bears her name at Oxford, was founded by Margaret, Countess of Richmond, mother of King Henry VII. Under Erasmus and the learned Bishop Fisher, the New Learning rapidly progressed at Cambridge, and met with much less opposition than it had on its introduction into Oxford ; and Erasmus was able to declare in 1516 that Cambridge "could compete with the best Universities of the world."

Whilst at Cambridge, Erasmus prepared his great work, the translation of the New Testament. In 1514 he left England, never to return (except for a short time in the following year), with the object of supervising its publication at Basle ; and on March 1, 1516, there was put forth, and dedicated to Pope Leo X., who accepted the dedication, the New Testament in Greek, side by side with which was a corrected Latin translation, with annotations, by Erasmus. These were not merely textual, but gave the opinions of Erasmus himself, sometimes not unlike, though

^e See p. 560.

in more sobered language, those before given in his *Moriæ Encomium* ; with allusions to the various abuses in the Church, with regard to ceremonies, Monasteries, vows, Penance, the worship of relics, marriage and divorce, and even the luxurious living of the Popes.

The effects produced by the New Learning were now apparent ; the Greek language had become familiar, and there was a wide-spread wish to possess the Testament in its original language ; so that three thousand three hundred folio copies were sold in three years.

As might be expected from the prevailing ignorance of the times, the work met with much opposition from the monks and Theologians. Immediately after the Invention of Printing, the Latin Bible had been printed, and from that version translations were made, before the end of the Fifteenth Century, into the languages of different Nations of Europe. This Latin Version was considered inspired, and the idea widely prevailed that Latin was the language in which both the Old and New Testaments had been originally written. The Priests themselves, perhaps, did not know better, or did not care to undeceive the people ; and the old Latin version was accepted by the Roman Church at the Council of Trent, as the authorised text.

It is needless to say that there were some mistakes in this translation ; but notwithstanding, it proved of vital importance to the Church ; through him a new era was opened to Biblical criticism ; and Erasmus, although he died a Roman Catholic, with perhaps a tinge of scepticism, was unconsciously paving the way to the Reformation.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE THREE REFORMATIONS.

CIRCUMSTANCES which led to the Reformation—Different effect of the Renaissance on the Latin and Teutonic Nations—Condition of the World—Bellarmine's opinion as to the necessity of the Reformation—Different characteristics of the Reformation in different Countries—The Protestant Reformation—The Roman Catholic—The Catholic.

SEVERAL circumstances in the early years of the Sixteenth Century forced on the Reformation of the Church. Chief amongst these must be placed the character of the Popes themselves, and, as a consequence, the form of intellectual Paganism which the Renaissance assumed in Italy. Pope Leo X., the patron of art and literature, has been described, not as a grossly immoral man, like many of his predecessors, but a cultured sceptic ; with little piety, careless about religion, even inclined to treat it as a jest. Leonardo da Vinci, and Michael Angelo, and Raphael, and Titian, and Paul Veronese, were all Italians ; thus in Italy the artistic revival was pre-eminent, and reached its climax. But in Italy this pre-eminence was attended by a marked decay of spiritual religion, and a corruption of morals ; whilst on this side of the Alps, and especially in Germany and England, the Renaissance assumed a literary and religious character. Thus a breach was effected between the Latin and Teutonic spirit ; the Teutonic Nations began to prepare for the long-delayed, but now inevitable, contest ; and the Renaissance and the Reformation to take different directions.

The Eastern Empire had been destroyed ; the Western Empire was little more than a name. Rome had ceased to be the centre of the world, in the same sense that it had been

formerly. The Popes of Rome had been the first power in the Church, for the same reason that the Roman Emperors had been the first power in the world; and with the decay of the Empire, the prestige and power of the Papacy was put on a new footing. The multiplication of books, and a great advance of learning, were the results of the invention of printing. When the whole intellectual world was astir; when nations were founding colonies in distant regions of the earth; when a New World had sprung into existence; it could not be expected that the Church alone would remain stagnant. What Councils could not, and Popes would not, effect, must be effected by the independent action of National Churches.

As to the necessity of the Reformation, we will quote the words of a Roman Catholic Cardinal, Bellarmine. "Some years," he says, "before the rise of the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresies, according to the assertions of those then living, there was an almost complete abandonment of equity in ecclesiastical judgments; no moral discipline; no erudition in sacred literature; no reverence of divine things; religion was almost extinct."

Through the arbitrary mismanagement of the Popes, the Eastern and Western Churches had long been hopelessly divided; and now, owing to the same cause, a still wider division was to be brought about in the Churches of the West.

The great event known as the Reformation assumed different forms, according to the different characteristics, and often the political circumstances, of the Nations which threw off the Papal Supremacy. Some nations, as England, revolted on questions which did not touch any essential points of the Faith; others, like Germany, and Switzerland, and Scotland, established new forms of Church government, and essentially new Churches; whilst other countries, like Ireland, refused the Reformation altogether, and adhered to the Church of Rome. Broadly speaking, Mr. Freeman says, the Teutonic Nations accepted the

new teaching, whilst the Romance nations clave to the See of Rome. The Roman Catholic Church itself saw the necessity of a Reformation, and, when it was too late, followed the example set by other nations, and likewise reformed itself.

Since, therefore, the Reformation assumed these different characteristics in different countries, we propose to treat it under three sections: — A. The Protestant Reformation, in those countries to which the name Protestant strictly belongs; B. The Roman Catholic Reformation, as that of the Church of Rome; C. The Catholic Reformation, as most fitly describing that of the Church of England.

A.—THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION.

DESIRE in Germany for a political and religious severance from Rome—The Emperor Charles V.—The German Constitution—Erasmus and Reuchlin—Reuchlin and Pfefferkorn—The Dominicans and Pope Leo—The *Epistola Obscurorum Virorum*—Hutten—Martin Luther—At the University of Erfurt—His doctrine of Justification—Professor at Wittenberg—Carlstadt—Luther goes to Rome—The Building of St. Peter's—Luther returns to Wittenberg—Indulgences—Tetzel—Luther's Theses—His respectful attitude towards Pope Leo—Cajetan—Luther at Augsburg—Miltitz—Eck and Luther—Luther's *Address to the Nobles of Germany*—His *Babylonish Captivity*—Henry VIIIth's *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum*—Luther's Treatise *On the Freedom of the Christian*—The Bull *Exsurge Domine*—Luther burns it—Diet of Worms—Luther at the Wurtburg—His Translation of the Bible—Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*—Riots at Wittenberg—The Anabaptists of Münster—Hadrian VI., Pope—Luther's Reply to Henry VIII.—War between France and Germany—Difficult position of Pope Clement VII.—The Battle of Pavia—The Holy Alliance—Renewed War between France and Germany—Pope Clement VII. and the Sack of Rome—Peace of Cambray—The Peasants' War—The Papal Nuncio at Nuremberg—Death of Pope Hadrian—Luther marries a Nun—Luther and Zwingle—Their doctrines on the Eucharist—That of Œcolampadius—Alliance of Torgau—Diet of Spires—The Elector of Saxony throws off the Supremacy of the Pope—Second Diet of Spires—The Protestants—The Lutheran Service Book—The *Greater* and the *Little Catechism*—The Meeting at Marburg—The Sweating Sickness—Diet of Augsburg—Augsburg Confession—The *Confutation*—Melanchthon's *Apology*—*Confessio Tetrapolitana*—The *Schmalcaldic League*—Death of Œcolampadius—Bullinger—*Religious Peace of Nuremberg*—Death of John, Elector of Saxony—Succeeded by John Frederic—Paul III., Pope—Convenes Council first to Mantua—Then to Vicenza—Unsuccessful in both instances—Helvetic Confession—Concord of Wittenberg—Vergerio—Diet and *Interim* of Regensburg—Trent proposed for meeting of Council—Renewed War between France and Germany—Peace of Crispy—Death of Luther—Schmalcaldic War—Battle of Mühlberg—Augsburg *Interim*—Leipsic *Interim*—The Adiaphoristic Controversy—Julius III., Pope—Treaty of Passau—Triumph of the German Reformation—The Reformation in France—Marguerite of Valois—Jeanne d'Albret—Condé—The three brothers Coligny—The Huguenots—The Eidgenossen—The Renaissance in France—Attitude of the King, Francis I., towards the Reformers—Catharine de' Medici—Francis II., the husband of Mary Stuart—Massacre of Amboise—The Chancellor de l'Hopital—War between the Huguenots and Catholics—War in the Netherlands—Philip II. of Spain—Execution of the Counts Egmont and Horn—Battles of Mont-

contour and Jarnac—Massacre of St. Bartholomew's—Henry IV., King of France—Toleration granted to the Huguenots by Edict of Nantes—Ulrich Zwingli—Sale of Indulgences in Switzerland—Reformation in Switzerland—Battle of Cappel—Zwingli killed—Reformation in Geneva—Bonivard—Farel—Viret—Calvin—The *Institutio Christianæ Religionis*—The *Reformed Faith*—Five Points of Calvinism—Character of Calvin—Servetus burnt—Beza—Patrick Hamilton—Wishart—Cardinal Beaton—John Knox—His *First Blast of the Trumpet*—The Lords of the Congregation—*Confession of Faith and Doctrine*—*Book of Discipline*—*Order of Geneva*—Superintendents—Return of Mary Stuart to Scotland—The *Book of Common Order*—Death of Knox—The Scottish Kirk.

THE Protestant Reformation derived, as might have been expected, its birth in Germany. The Germans never forgot, nor forgave, the humiliation and indignity to which the Popes had subjected the Emperors. There is little doubt but that a large numerical preponderance of the German people had long been gravitating towards a political and religious severance from Rome. But to understand *why*, if the German people were so desirous of a Reformation, it was only effected under great difficulties, and accompanied by much bloodshed, we must understand the political circumstances of the German Empire at the time.

As a result of the marriage of Isabella of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon, the Spanish monarchy became consolidated, and Spain was the most powerful monarchy in the world. The great Queen Isabella died, A.D. 1504, leaving a daughter Joanna, who married Philip, Archduke of Austria, the son of the Emperor Maximilian I., and Mary of Burgundy, daughter of Charles the Bold. She became the mother of the future Emperor, Charles V., of whom much will be heard in this Chapter. Charles, by the death of his grandfather Ferdinand, A.D. 1516, succeeded to the Spanish dominions, whilst on the death of his father and his other grandfather, Maximilian I., in 1519, he came into possession of Burgundy and the Netherlands, and was elected German Emperor; and is better known by his Imperial title Charles V., than by his title of Charles I. of Spain.

Charles, as a Spaniard, was firmly attached to the Roman Church, although he was inclined to tolerate the Protestants. But, as between him and Francis I., King of France (1515—1547), there were frequent wars, the Emperor's attitude towards the Protestant movement was actuated more by political than religious considerations. In 1556 he abdicated the Imperial throne in favour of his brother Ferdinand I. (1556—1564), who, himself a zealous Catholic, was desirous of furthering a reunion between the Catholics and Protestants. Charles' son, Philip II., who, A.D. 1554, took as his second wife, Mary, Queen of England, succeeded him as King of Spain. Charles, on resigning his dominions, retired into a monastery in Spain, where he died two years afterwards.

Besides the Emperor of Germany, there were a number of independent German Princes. There was an Imperial Court, (*Reichskammergericht*), composed of elected members of their order, to decide on questions which arose amongst the Princes. Under the *Golden Bull* of 1356 the Emperor was elected by seven Princes, hence called Electors. Four of these were laymen, the Count Palatine, the Elector of Saxony, the Margrave of Brandenburg, and the King of Bohemia; the three others being ecclesiastics, the Archbishops of Maintz, Treves, and Cologne.

The Diet was a general assembly or congress, in which the Three Estates of the Empire met together in three houses, one house consisting of the Electors (of whom, however, the King of Bohemia only had a voice in the election of the Emperor); the next house being the house of Princes, comprising persons both lay and ecclesiastical. Lastly came the *Free Imperial Cities* (the only popular element, says Mr. Gardiner, in the Diet), but holding an inferior position to the other two houses. Thus in the Diet the Electors and Princes exercised a preponderating, if not an exclusive, influence.

There was nothing corresponding to our House of Commons,

so that, though all the nation might be on one side, the Emperor and Princes were able to nullify its acts and wishes. This will explain the proceedings which attended the Germanic Reformation; and how that, though the great mass of the nation was in favour of Luther's views, the Diet was so constituted as to be hostile to change, and to render the wishes of the people nugatory.

Martin Luther (1483—1546) was the prime mover in the Germanic Reformation, although he had forerunners in Erasmus and Reuchlin, through whose means Scholasticism became nearly a dead letter, and Humanism so extensively cultivated, that they were commonly known as the "two eyes of Germany." Luther was said to have hatched the egg which Erasmus laid; but the latter, who remained a Romanist till his death, denied the insinuation, and claimed that the bird which Luther hatched was totally different from the egg which had been laid.

John Reuchlin (1455—1522), Professor in the University of Ingolstadt, was not only a great Latin and Greek scholar, but (a thing very rare at that time) a proficient in the Hebrew language, which he had learnt in the only way it was attainable, from a Jewish Rabbi. In 1506 he published a Hebrew Grammar, a work of the first importance at that time. His humanistic studies brought him into conflict with the adherents of Scholasticism, in whose eyes the New Learning savoured of heresy. Reuchlin was favourably disposed towards the Jews, as from them alone the knowledge of Hebrew could be acquired. This stirred up against him the wrath of a converted Jew named Pfefferkorn, who after his conversion took to persecuting his former co-religionists, and proposed in 1509, to the Emperor Maximilian that their books, especially the Talmud and Kabala, should be destroyed as dangerous to Christians. Reuchlin, being asked his opinion, gave it to the effect, that they could not possibly be dangerous to Christians, inasmuch as no Christian could be found who understood Hebrew; that the existence

of such books might be an incentive to the study of that language; and he proposed that two Hebrew Professors should be established in every University, in order that Christians might be able to learn Hebrew, and thus defeat the Jews on their own ground. A long paper-war ensued, in which Pfefferkorn attacked Reuchlin, and Reuchlin him; Pfefferkorn told a number of lies about Reuchlin; Reuchlin lost his temper, and also used bad language, which brought upon him the censure of Erasmus. The Dominicans took part against the Humanist; but Pope Leo X., who was a favourer of the New Learning, at any rate at first, defended him, which brought upon the Pope the wrath of the Dominicans, who threatened to secede and join the Bohemians or Hussites. Reuchlin being forced by the plague to leave Ingolstadt, went to Tübingen, where he died in his sixty-seventh year, having gained the victory for Humanism.

A quarrel in which he was engaged with the Clergy of Cologne gave rise to the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* (letters of obscure men), a brilliant satire on the Old Learning and the monks. As Erasmus had in his *Moriæ Encomium* exposed the follies of Scholasticism and the monks, so Ulrich von Hutten (1488—1522), a native of Stackelburg, a brilliant satirist, who had been a monk but made his escape from the Monastery of Fulda (to whom much of the second part of the *Epistolæ* is due), exposed, in bitter satire, the monks, as well as the Church of Rome, to the opprobrium of mankind. We give the following short extracts (as quoted from Strauss), of his attack on the See of Rome. Three things, he says, are proscribed in Rome, simplicity, temperance, and piety. Three things people do not like to hear of, a General Council, a Reformation of the Clergy, and that the Germans are coming to their senses. With three things do the Romans commerce, with Christ, with spiritual fiefs (*benefices*) and with women. Three things are taken from Rome by pilgrims, defiled consciences, violated stomachs, and

empty purses. For centuries Peter's Chair has been occupied, not by true followers of him but, of Nero and Heliogabalus. The Papal Court is the sink of all corruption. Hutten died at Zurich (where he found a friend in Zwingle), at the age of thirty-four.

Unlike Hutten, Luther at first made no assault on the character of the Popes ; so far from this, he attributed all the corruptions of the Church, not to Pope Leo, whom he even extols beyond his merits, but to the circumstances of the times.

Martin Luther was born at Eisleben, a town of Saxony, of humble parentage, his father being a miner. At fourteen years of age he was sent first to the Franciscan School of Magdeburg ; and afterwards to the Franciscan School of Eisenach, where he remained four years ; and as his father was not able to bear the expense of his education, he was obliged, after the manner of poor scholars at the time, to gain his own living by singing carols in the streets. At eighteen he entered the then famous University of Erfurt, a noted seat of Humanistic studies, and in its library, for the first time in his life, saw a copy of the whole Bible.

In July, 1505, when he was near Erfurt, on a return journey from visiting his parents, he was overtaken by a terrific thunder-storm, by which his companion at his side was killed. That was the turning-point in his life. Trembling with fear, he fell to the ground, and vowed that, if he escaped safely, he would become a monk. He afterwards repented of his vow, but as he had made it, resolved to abide by it. Though destined by his father for the Law, he now, contrary to his father's wish, entered the Augustinian Monastery at Erfurt, where he devoted himself to the Greek and Latin languages, and to the study of the Fathers, especially St. Augustine ; and there also he found a copy of the Scriptures. The study of the Bible thenceforward absorbed his interest, and was the groundwork of the German Reformation.

At this time he imbibed those peculiar views on Justification, which imbued his teaching throughout his whole after-life. Man's righteousness, he believed, was wholly passive, and entirely independent of him. Through the Fall of Adam, man is so thoroughly depraved, that not one spark of goodness remains in him, and he is incapable of performing anything for his own restoration. Yet repentance is not only not necessary, but is even dangerous; the sinner is clothed upon by Christ's Righteousness, as a mere act of faith, so that no good works, and no Sacraments are required; sinful acts cease to be sinful, so long as they are done when a man is in a state of Justification. It is unnecessary to point out how dangerous, and how opposed to Catholic truth, such a doctrine is.

In 1507 he was ordained Priest, and in the same year was appointed Professor of Philosophy in the University of Wittenberg, which had been founded, A.D. 1502, by Frederick the Wise, Elector of Saxony. It is somewhat significant that Wittenberg was the first German University which received its Charter, not from the Pope, but from the Emperor, Maximilian I.; and an oath of obedience to the Pope was not, as in other convents, required. Here Luther delivered lectures on the Bible; his antipathy, which he had before begun to entertain for the Schoolmen and Aristotle, increased, and he succeeded in drawing over to his views Carlstadt, who five years before had been appointed Professor of Scholasticism in the same University.

In 1510 he was sent on a Commission about affairs respecting the Convent, to Rome; and although his visit there of four years did not turn him against the Papacy as it had existed in early times, yet he gained an insight into the levity and unbelief of the Clergy, from the lowest to the highest; he witnessed also the magnificence and corruption of the Papal Curia under Pope Julius II., who was then progressing with the building

of the new Church of St. Peter's, which was to be carried out in all the grandeur which art or money could furnish.

On his return to Wittenberg, he was elected Sub-Prior of the Convent.

The immediate occasion of Luther's struggle with Rome, which led to the German Reformation, arose out of the building of St. Peter's. Julius II. was succeeded (1513—1521) by Leo X. Luther had hitherto, whilst attacking its abuses, been a faithful and submissive son of the Church, when suddenly the scandal of the abuse of Purgatorial Indulgences broke out. Indulgences had originally been granted on repentance; but of late a change had taken place, and a price had been put upon sins, a money-payment being accepted in lieu of repentance.

The sale of Indulgences, as a means of getting money for the building of St. Peter's, was entrusted by the Pope to Albert, Elector-Archbishop of Maintz and Magdeberg, in the latter of which Dioceses Wittenberg was situated. It was noised abroad that part of this money was destined for the Papal exchequer; it was known that the Pope and Archbishop had entered upon an agreement, by which the latter was allowed to hold half of it, in order to pay off a loan which he had contracted to obtain the Pall from the Pope. The Archbishop appointed as his sub-commissioner one Tetzel, a man of notoriously profligate character, a Dominican Monk, a member, that is, of the Order to which Thomas Aquinas, who had been the principal advocate of Indulgences amongst the schoolmen, belonged.

In 1517 Tetzel arrived in the neighbourhood of Wittenberg, and offered his Indulgences for sale in the streets. Luther, with his intimate knowledge of the Bible, was the very man to be shocked with the horrible profanity that forgiveness of sins under any shape could be purchased by money; and he felt the danger of his own people being misled by the imposition. On October 31 of that year he nailed ninety-five Latin theses against the In-

dulgences to the church-door of Wittenberg. These theses were not only protests against Tetzel, but they also embodied the central points of his doctrine of Justification by Faith, and Election by Grace. They were not protests against the Pope, nor even against Indulgences, but against the false teaching of the Quæstors, or sellers of Indulgences ; they were an attempt to revive the true meaning of Indulgences, viz., the remission of Ecclesiastical censures. They were not intended to lay down the law on the subject, but, according to the custom prevalent amongst Theologians and in the German Universities, to invite disputation, Luther prefacing them that they were issued in charity, and with the hope of bringing the truth to light. Nor were they intended to call in question the authority of the Pope, but only the conduct of his commissioners, of which he assumed the Pope to be ignorant ; and on the very day of publication he sent a copy of them to the Archbishop, his "reverend Father in Christ."

A mere glance at a few of them is sufficient to show Luther's feeling at the time to the Pope. Thesis V. states that the Pope neither has the will nor power to remit any penalties, except such as have been imposed by his own authority or by the Canons. Consequently (XX.), when the Pope speaks of remission of all penalties, he must be speaking only of those imposed by himself. But (XXXVI.) the remission given by the Pope is not to be despised, since it is a declaration of the divine remission. And (L.) if the Pope was acquainted with the exactions of the preachers of the pardons, rather than that the Basilica of St. Peter's should be erected by such means, he would prefer that it should be burnt to ashes. (LXXI.) If any one should speak against Apostolical pardons, let him be Anathema ; although (LXXII.), if he exerts himself against the wantonness and license of the preachers, let him be blessed. We affirm (LXXVI.) that Papal pardons cannot take away guilt of even the least of venial sins. If the Pope had such a power, he lays himself open to the calumny of the Laity, who ask (LXXII.) why he does not

at once empty Purgatory, if he can redeem an infinite number of souls for the sake of building a Basilica? Again, the Laity ask (LXXXVI.), why does not the Pope, who is the wealthiest of the wealthy, build St. Peter's from his own money, rather than from that of poor believers? If pardons were only preached in accordance with the spirit and mind of the Pope, such calumnies would cease.

Firm as Luther was against the false Indulgences and the salesmen, such was his respectful language to the Pope personally; he never at that time contemplated a rupture, and even thought that Leo would support him. However the die was now cast; this was Luther's first step, which soon led him on to others, and to the attack of the Head on earth of the Church himself.

In 1518, nearly a year after the publication of the Theses, Luther was joined at Wittenberg by his thenceforward life-long friend and fellow-labourer in the German Reformation, a man more learned than himself, Melanchthon (1497—1560). Melanchthon's mother, or, to call him by his German patronymic, Schwarzed (*black-earth*, the equivalent of the Greek Melanchthon), was the niece of Reuchlin, by whom he was educated, first in the school of Pforzheim, and afterwards at the Universities of Heidelberg and Tübingen. In 1516 Erasmus said of him, "What expectations does Philip Melancthon, who as a mere boy has gained equal eminence in Greek and Latin literature, not give rise to! What purity of style! What rare learning! What comprehensive reading!" On the recommendation of Reuchlin, Frederick the Wise appointed him, in 1518, to the Greek Professorship at Wittenberg.

The sensation which the Theses produced far exceeded the expectations of Luther. They were at once translated into German, and in fourteen days ran through Germany, where they found the soil well prepared for their acceptance. In his *Solutions*, or explanation of the Theses, which he published on

May 30, 1518, dedicating the treatise to the Pope, whose voice he said he would recognise "as the voice of Christ," he complained of being charged with heresy. "Brother Martin," said Leo, "is a man of genius;" he was at first inclined to think lightly of the matter; "the Theses were only the work of a drunken German," who would repent when he got sober. But the Pope soon went a step further, and on August 7 summoned Luther to appear at Rome within sixty days; and he appointed as his Legate Thomas de Vio, known as Cajetan (i.e. of Gaeta), to induce the Emperor Maximilian, and Frederick, the Elector of Saxony, to deliver up this "child of the devil." To obey the summons would have been tantamount to thrusting his head into the lion's mouth. The University of Wittenberg objected to his being tried out of Germany, and the Elector induced Cajetan to hear Luther at Augsburg. At Augsburg, accordingly, he appeared on October 11. He refused to retract anything unless convicted out of Scripture, or by a legitimate decision of the Church; and, on Cajetan threatening him with excommunication, appealed "from Pope ill-informed to Pope better informed." As to Cajetan himself, Luther formed the opinion that he knew about as much Theology as an ass about playing on the harp. On October 20, his friends, fearing treachery, sent him off by night, under a strong escort, to Wittenberg.

The Emperor Maximilian dying in January, 1519, was succeeded by Charles, King of Spain, a stranger to German life and feeling.

In the same month Miltitz, the Papal Chamberlain, a man of a good family in Saxony, a friend of the Elector, and of a milder and more conciliatory disposition than Cajetan, was sent to Germany by the Pope for the double purpose of convincing Luther of his errors, and bridling Tetzl, whose extravagant pretensions had now disgusted the Pope himself. Miltitz held an interview with Luther in the house of Spalatin, the Elector's Chaplain, at Altenberg. He failed to induce him to retract his

opinions, but Luther again adopted a conciliatory course, and promised to write a respectful letter to the Pope.

From conciliatory measures, however, he was deflected by the violence of Dr. John Maier, or (as he is more familiarly known from his birth-place) Eck, Professor of Theology at Ingoldstadt, a man of extensive learning in the Scholastic Theology; "a wrong-headed fellow" Luther called him.

With Eck Luther joined in a famous disputation at Leipsic. It began on June 27, 1519, with the celebration of Mass, and extended to July 17. For the first week the discussion was carried on between Eck and Luther's colleague, Carlstadt, and related to Justification and Good Works; and for the remainder of the time between Eck and Luther, chiefly on the points of the Papal Supremacy and Purgatory. Eck had the advantage of Luther in Philosophy and the Canon Law, whilst Luther was his superior in the knowledge of the Bible and the Fathers. Luther had before asserted that, previously to the time of Gregory the Great, the Church of Rome enjoyed no superiority over other Churches. He maintained that the Church could exist without the Pope, and instanced the Greek Church, with its great Fathers, SS. Basil and Gregory Nazianzen. He next discarded Purgatory. Eck insisted upon Tradition, avoiding all reference to the Bible, which Luther constantly brought forward. The end was, as might have been expected, that neither was convinced, though both claimed the victory.

The discussion initiated a new stage in Luther's career. He had now attacked the historical basis of the Papacy and the Roman Church; and the discussion was favourable to the Reformation, for Luther had drawn over the Humanists to his side; and he now acknowledged that thenceforward his connection with the Curia was severed.

In July, 1520, he published his address to the *Christian Nobles throughout Germany*, pointing out the grievances under which Germany suffered, the need of a Council to be convened

by the temporal power and not by the Pope, and distinguishing the Roman Curia from the Roman Church. "It is horrible," he says, "to behold the Chief of Christendom living in such worldliness and magnificence as no King or Emperor can equal;" he censures the worldly lives of the Cardinals and the appointment of foreigners to German Bishoprics.

In October of the same year he wrote his work *On the Babylonish Captivity of the Church*, in which he attacked the Roman doctrine of seven Sacraments (himself holding to three, Baptism, Penance, and the Eucharist); the withholding the Cup from the Laity, in opposition to the Institution by Christ; and insisted on Consubstantiation, against Transubstantiation, in the Eucharist, the latter of which doctrines, he said, was derived from Aristotle. It was against this work that Henry VIII. wrote his *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum* (*the Assertion of Seven Sacraments*), which won for him and the sovereigns of England the title of Defenders of the Faith. But it would seem that Henry was somewhat influenced by his opponent, for we find in the Ten Articles of 1536^a a recognition of the same three Sacraments.

In the same month he fulfilled the promise which he had made to Miltitz, of addressing a letter to the Pope, and sent with it a treatise which he had published *On the Freedom of the Christian*, which asserted the freedom of every individual Christian, untrammelled by decrees of Popes or of the Church. In the letter he treats the Pope with the same respect as before, speaking of him as a lamb amongst wolves; he implores Leo, "his Father," to remember that he was a servant of servants, and not to give heed to men, who make him superior to Councils, and would persuade him that he had power over Heaven, Purgatory, and Hell.

Before the letter or the treatise arrived in Rome, Leo had, on June 15, issued from Rome his Bull, "Exsurge Domine," excommunicating Luther, which was brought into Germany by

^a See C. The Catholic Reformation.

Eck. In opposition to the Bull, Luther had the Elector Frederic and the University of Wittenberg on his side ; and on December 10 he publicly burnt it outside the Elster Gate of the City. Thus his final secession from Rome was consummated, and the burning of the Bull may be taken as the commencement of the Germanic Reformation.

War between Germany and France was now imminent, and the Pope, on May 29, 1521, signed a treaty of alliance with the Emperor, the latter promising to suppress the rising heresy in Germany. The Emperor, being a foreigner, was ignorant of the strong anti-papal feeling which had long existed in Germany. In 1521, he held the Diet of Worms, and Luther was summoned by him, at the instigation of the Pope, to appear before it, under promise from the Emperor of a safe guidance. In vain his friends, remembering the fate of Huss, implored him not to go ; " If there were as many devils in Worms as there are tiles on the houses, I would go," was his reply. At the meeting of the Diet on April 18, at which the Emperor presided, Luther was asked whether he would recant. He said he was the prisoner for God's Word ; " I neither will nor can recant ; . . . here I stand, I cannot do otherwise. So help me, God. Amen." On April 25 the ban of the Empire was proclaimed against him. The next day he left Worms for Wittenburg. But the Elector, considering his life to be in danger, conveyed him privately to a castle at Wurtburg, where he resided for ten months, under the disguise of Junker Georg.

On May 26 the Emperor issued the Edict of Worms, confirming the ban placed on Luther ; little regard, however, was paid to it in Germany.

Luther's residence in the Wurtburg marks an important era in the Germanic Reformation, for he commenced a German translation of the New Testament, which he afterwards (A.D. 1523) published, to be followed by a translation of the whole Bible, in 1533.

In 1521 Melancthon published in Latin at Wittenberg his *Loci Communes*, in which he deduced from the Bible a systematic digest of Faith, which became a standard-work of Protestant Theology.

In that year also Henry VIII. published his *Treatise on the Seven Sacraments*, in answer to Luther's *Babylonish Captivity*.

During Luther's absence, a serious socialistic insurrection, incited by his former colleague, Carlstadt, broke out at Wittenberg, with which the gentle spirit of Melancthon was unable to cope. On Christmas Day, A.D. 1521, Carlstadt celebrated the Eucharist under Both Kinds. Shortly afterwards he took to himself a wife. A body of fanatics demanded the abolition of every rite to which they were opposed. Infant Baptism was rejected; the Roman Mass forbidden; the reception of the Holy Communion under One kind pronounced to be a sin; Monks and Nuns were induced to leave their Convents; Priests married; and Holy Images and Pictures were destroyed. With some of these innovations Luther was personally in sympathy, but he was altogether opposed to compulsion. So leaving the Wurtburg, his *Patmos*, as he called it, he arrived at Wittenberg on March 6, 1522, and quickly allayed the storm to his satisfaction.

But this was only the beginning of the evils which rent the State asunder. Politics and Religion became inextricably mixed together, and reformation, under the name of religious liberty, degenerated into licence and destruction. Two years after Luther's return, the Peasants' War^b broke out. In 1534 the Anabaptists, having got possession of Münster, pillaged the Cathedral, desecrated Altars, destroyed Churches, established a community of goods, proclaimed polygamy, and committed fearful acts of debauchery and crime. The insurrection was with difficulty put down, but it had given the death-blow to Protestantism in the City, for those who had been its staunchest adherents refused to have anything further to do with it, and returned to the old Faith.

^b See p. 570.

In December 21, 1521, Leo X. died and was succeeded by Hadrian VI. (1522—1523), a native of Utrecht.

In August, 1522, Luther sent to Henry VIII. his reply to the latter's Treatise on the Seven Sacraments. He calls the King a fool and an ass, and amongst other far from polite expressions, he says, "When God needs a fool, He turns a King into a theological writer."

In 1521 the long threatened war between France and Germany had broken out. Before, however, giving an account of it, a short digression must be made, in order the better to understand the relations which long existed between the Emperor and the King of France, and the attitude of the Pope towards them.

Both Charles and Francis had endeavoured to enlist Henry VIII. on their side. With a view to such an alliance Charles had himself come to England, in May, 1520, and succeeded in persuading Cardinal Wolsey to support him, by a promise of favouring his aspirations to the Papacy. But neither on that occasion, nor in a subsequent meeting at Gravelines, did he succeed in obtaining from Henry anything further than a promise not to join his adversary. Between these two interviews, Henry held another with Francis on a spot which, from the magnificence which accompanied the meeting, has become famous in history as *The Field of the Cloth of Gold*. Francis, however, failed to make on him any impression.

In May, 1522, however, led by the entreaties of Wolsey, Henry adopted the cause of the Emperor, and declared war against France. The war between Charles and Francis lasted with a short intermission between 1521—1526.

Francis I. inaugurated the first year of his reign by the invasion of Lombardy; and having, by his victory in the battle of Marignano, gained possession of Milan, on October 4, 1515, concluded the *Concordat*^c with Pope Leo, who was desirous of arranging with so powerful a King, the unsatisfactory relations

^c See p. 534.

which had existed between the Popes and the Kings of France ever since the reign of Louis XI.

Francis (together with Henry VIII. of England) had been a competitor with Charles V. for the German Crown ; that was not conducive to the promotion of good feeling between France and Germany ; and in the wars which ensued, between a powerful King like Francis, and a powerful Emperor like Charles, both of whom were Catholics, the Popes were in a strait as to which of the two would be of most use to them in their struggles with the Reformers, and which side, therefore, to adopt.

Next after Hadrian, Clement VII. (1523—1534) followed as Pope, who in an evil hour sided with France against the Emperor, with what disastrous results to himself and to Rome we shall hear.

In February, 1525, Francis being defeated and made prisoner in the Battle of Pavia, was carried away captive by the Emperor to Madrid. In August of the same year Henry VIII., alarmed at the successes and great power of the Emperor, entered into a defensive alliance with France, promising to exert himself for the deliverance of the King ; soon afterwards he formed a secret alliance with Pope Clement, to deliver Italy out of the hands of the Emperor.

In January, 1526, Francis regained his liberty by signing a humiliating treaty at Madrid. He bound himself to give up Milan, and made several other concessions, which he took the earliest opportunity of breaking. In March he again entered his own dominions ; in vain Charles requested him to perform his promises, and, on his refusal, again prepared for war. Francis entered into the alliance with the Pope, the Duke of Milan, and the Venetians, which is known as the *Holy Alliance* ; an unfortunate title, since by it the Pope adopted the unholy measure of freeing the King from all the oaths he had taken to the Emperor, relying on the faith of which the Emperor had released him from imprisonment.

The war between King and Emperor was renewed; the Emperor also made war upon the Pope, and threw off the Papal Supremacy in his Spanish dominions. On May 5, 1527, he appeared before the walls of Rome. For seven months the city was given over to a merciless plunder and destruction, the Pope himself, after suffering much cruel indignity, being made a prisoner in the Castle of St. Angelo, the German soldiers shouting out in mockery that now Luther should be Pope. France was at length worn out by the long protracted war; the Emperor also, threatened with the outbreak of a war with the Lutherans, and by the aggressions of the Turks under their leader Suluman, was desirous of peace. So in July, 1529, the *Peace of Cambray* was concluded, by which peace, on humiliating terms to Francis, was restored between him, the Emperor, and the Pope; and Charles promised Clement that he would assist him in the extirpation of the pestilential disease of heresy.

We must now go back a few years to the history of the Germanic Reformation; but before doing so we must allude to an event, not wholly unconnected with it.

At the end of the year 1524 and the beginning of 1525 occurred the Peasants' War. The Peasants in South Germany had long suffered under intolerable burdens and taxes imposed by the Nobles, both Lay and Clerical, and for many years a Peasants' League or Bundshuh had existed, ready for revolution, with the view of the readjustment of the relations of the various classes of Society. This combustible material, although quite distinct from the question of Church reform, and although it met with the strongest opposition from Luther, was fanned into flame by the shape which the German Reformation had assumed. Some enthusiasts persuaded the people that there was a large democratic side in Christianity, which provided for all classes deliverance from political as well as spiritual injustice; and as Christ died for rich and poor alike,

the Peasants were brought to believe that in fighting for their civil rights they were fighting the cause of the Church.

So they eagerly embraced the Reformation. They drew up their complaints under twelve heterogeneous articles, one of which claimed the right of each Parish to appoint its own minister, another the partial abolition of tithes, whilst a third demanded the right of all alike to hunt and fish, on the ground that to man was given the domination over the animal creation. If they were wrong, they said, Luther would set them right out of the Bible. Luther not only sided against them, but he wrote to them that they were greater enemies of the Gospel than the Pope or the Emperor, and he urged the Princes to put them down by force of arms. The end was that the rebellion was quelled, the insurgents mercilessly punished, and subjected for the future to greater oppression than before.

Pope Hadrian II. the successor of Leo X., who had been a Dominican Monk, and a former tutor of Charles V., was a man of unblemished character, but so far from being, like his predecessor, a patron of learning, was an ardent follower of Scholasticism. The German Bishops had now almost everywhere pronounced against the iniquitous sale of Indulgences. Hadrian, though hating the new doctrines of Luther, was sensible of the degradation of the Church, and was at heart a reformer.

In January, 1523, a nuncio appeared before a Diet at Nuremberg with a Brief from the Pope. The nuncio called upon the Princes of Germany assembled in the Diet, to carry out the edict of Worms, and to put down Luther, with his foul and obscene heresy. Luther, he said, had not, though condemned, been punished. As Dathan and Abiram were swallowed up in the gulph; as St. Peter had decried death on Ananias and Sapphira; as the Council of Constance had punished Huss and Jerome; so now ought they to follow their illustrious examples, and gain an eternal reward. The Papal Brief admitted that

all the evils which beset the Church from the Lutheran heresy arose from the "abominations and spiritual abuses" which existed in the Papacy, and from the sins of Prelates and Priests; and he promised to reform the Church.

The Diet allowed that confusion in Germany had followed on Luther's teaching, but to attack his doctrines would be to attack the freedom of the Gospel. His teaching and his writings had convinced the German people of the oppressions under which they were suffering. The Pope had acknowledged the evils of the Curia and promised reform; let him perform his promise, and, with the consent of the Emperor, summon a Council to assemble within a year at some place in Germany. Thus the Diet determined that it was impossible to carry out the decree of the Diet of Worms; Luther was established on a firmer pedestal, and the German Reformation entered on another stage.

Hadrian, when he promised a reform of the Church, promised more than he was able to perform. He was little experienced in the business of life; as a foreigner he little understood the character of the Italian people; a reforming Pope was an unheard of marvel. Abuses had struck too deep a root to be easily eradicated; the interests of the Curialists were too much involved to make them desirous of reform; and Hadrian's early death in September, 1523, which was attributed to poison administered by his physician, was the subject of rejoicing amongst Roman dignitaries.

Julius de' Medici, an illegitimate nephew of Leo X., who succeeded as Clement VII., was a man, except with respect to his greed for enriching himself and the Medici family with the spoils of the Church, of blameless character; but he had no wish to effect a reformation.

In the autumn of 1524 Luther laid aside the monastic cowl; and in the next year, when he was forty-one years of age, he gave great scandal by marrying Catharine von Bora,

a nun, in her twenty-sixth year, who had escaped from her convent.

In 1525 the seeds of a controversy were sown between Luther and the Swiss reformer, Zwingli, as to the Holy Eucharist. Both Luther and Zwingli regarded the Eucharist as the highest act of divine worship, and both rejected the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation. But they differed as to the meaning of the copula in the words of institution. Luther held that it must be taken in its literal sense, and that after Consecration the Body and Blood of Christ are substantially contained in the Bread and Wine. Zwingli held that the words, *This is My Body*, merely signify This is *like* My Body, and referred to similar metaphors in the Bible, such as I am the Vine; the seven kine in Pharaoh's dream *are* seven years, i.e. *signify* seven years.

Such was the commencement of Protestant variations, which foreshadowed the inevitable result of individual interpretation. When the ball was once set rolling, it did not again stand still. Carlstadt held that the words of Institution do not refer to the Bread and Wine at all, but that Christ, pointing to His own Body, used the words, "This is My Body which is broken—My Blood which is shed—for you."

Æcolampadius (οἶκου λάμπας, 1482—1531), a native of Suabia, who having imbibed the new opinions, was appointed Professor of Divinity at Basle in 1522, professing to follow Tertullian, SS. Chrysostom and Augustine, took another view, and although he accepted the word *is* in its literal sense, referred it, not to the subject, but the predicate, "My Body, My Blood."

The Elector, Frederick the *Wise*, dying in 1525, was succeeded by his brother John, surnamed the *Steadfast*.

In November, the new Elector of Saxony and Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, formed a defensive and offensive alliance, which was ratified by the League of Torgau, in May, 1526, to support each other, if necessary, in defence of their opinions; and the

alliance was strengthened at Magdeburg, in June, by several other German Princes.

On June 25, a Diet assembled at Spires, which was presided over by Ferdinand, brother of the Emperor, and was attended by the two principal reforming Princes, the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse. The Diet sat during the time when the Emperor and the Pope were at war, and, as might be expected, Ferdinand would not be desirous of favouring the latter. Several reforming measures, such as Communion in Both Kinds and the Marriage of the Clergy, were brought forward, but without any decision with regard to them being arrived at. It was, however, resolved that the Emperor should be requested to come to Germany, in order to arrange for a Council, until which time each State should be allowed to hold its own religious belief, "subject only to God, and his Imperial Majesty." On this Diet, says Ranke, rests the establishment of a new Church, and on it the legal existence of the Protestant party in the Empire was based.

In 1527, the Elector John established in his dominions a form of ecclesiastical worship and government, drawn up by Luther and Melancthon, and threw off the supremacy of the Pope, many of the Princes following his example.

On March 15, 1529, a second Diet assembled at Spires. In the meantime peace had been concluded between the Emperor and Pope, on the condition that the two should work together to extirpate the new opinions. In the Diet the Catholic party, amongst whom was Eck, predominated, and the edict of the former Diet was cancelled.

Against this decision, the Reformers drew up a formal *protestation*, which was signed by John, the Elector of Saxony, the Margrave of Brandenburg, the Landgrave of Hesse, two Dukes, the Chancellor of Lüneburg, and the deputies of fourteen cities. This document, which was framed on April 20, they demanded should be attached to the decree of the Diet, and

from it the new party derived the name *Protestants*. The majority of the Diet, and Ferdinand in the number, threatened them, in case of their persistence, with coercion and the employment of force.

For some time the Lutherans had conducted their services in Latin, portions of the Bible being read to, and hymns sung by, the congregations, in German. But Luther drew up a complete service, based on the old services, in German, which appeared in 1526, under the title of *The German Mass and Order of Divine Service at Wittenberg*.

Early in 1529 Luther published his *Greater Catechism*, intended especially for the Clergy, and, later on, his *Little Catechism*, or *Enchiridion*, the latter more particularly adapted for younger people.

In October a conference, fraught with important consequences to the foreign Reformation, took place in the Landgrave's Castle at Marburg. Against the threat of coercion made by the Catholics, the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse, fortified themselves by an agreement with the cities of Nuremberg, Strasburg, and Ulm, which the Landgrave, who was already suspected of a leaning towards the Swiss Reformer Zwingle, desired to be extended to the reformers of Switzerland. To this, however, Luther, and with him were the Elector and Melancthon, was altogether opposed. The Landgrave, however, so persisted as to arrange a meeting, in October, 1529, in his own Castle at Marburg. Thither repaired, amongst others, Luther and Melancthon from Wittenberg, Zwingle and Œcolampadius from Switzerland, Bucer from Strasburg, and Osiander (whose daughter Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, took as his second wife,) from Nuremberg. The general debate, which took place in the presence of the Landgrave, was conducted, on the one side, by Luther and Melancthon, on the other, by Zwingle and Œcolampadius. Luther chalked on the table before him the words, *This is My Body*, to the literal meaning

of which he adhered throughout. His opponents referred to antiquity, especially to St. Augustine; Luther could not be deflected a hair's breadth; he put a different construction on their passages, and adhered to his four words. The *Sweating Sickness*, a new pestilence which had lately broken out in Germany, made its appearance at Marburg, and the Conference was broken up, the chief point of dispute remaining as undecided as before. But thenceforward the teachers of the new opinions were known under the distinct titles of *Lutherans* and *Reformed*.

The Emperor Charles who, after the Peace of Cambray, was beyond dispute the most powerful monarch in the world, determined to impose his will on the faith of Western Christendom. On May 30, 1530, he went into Germany, and on June 20 opened the Diet of Augsburg. Luther, being under the ban of the Empire, did not receive a safe-conduct; and by the advice of the Elector remained at Coburg, as a convenient spot where, if necessary, he might be appealed to. The Protestants, on June 25, brought before the Council their *Confession of Faith*, which was afterwards known as the *Augsburg Confession*, and which became the main standard of the Lutheran Faith. Its preparation had been entrusted to Melanchthon, a man more learned and less violent than Luther; and the document, when completed and approved by Luther, who said that he could not possibly improve it, was signed by the Elector of Saxony, the Landgrave of Hesse, the Margrave of Brandenburg, the Duke of Lüneberg, and the Prince of Anhalt. It consisted of two parts, the first containing Twenty-two Articles on matters of Faith, the Second, Seven Articles condemnatory of abuses. Many of the Articles of the Confession were taken as the ground-work of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England.

The Confession made a good impression on the Diet, but Eck asserted that he could easily refute it, if not out of the

Scriptures, yet out of the Fathers. Accordingly on August 3 the *Confutation*, drawn up by a Committee of Catholic Theologians, was presented to the Diet; whereupon the Emperor required the Protestants to acknowledge their errors and return to the Church. This they refused to do. On August 6 the Landgrave, deeply offended with the proceedings of the Catholics, secretly quitted the Diet. On September 22 Melancthon offered to the Emperor his *Apology for the Confession*, written after the *Confutation* of the Catholics; but the Emperor refused to receive it.

The Zwinglians also presented to the Emperor their own *Confession*, which differed from the Augsburg Confession, chiefly with regard to the Eucharist, and which, proceeding from the four cities, Strasburg, Constance, Lindau, and Memmingen, was called *Confessio Tetrapolitana*, (the Confession of the Four Cities).

The Emperor, who had long been negotiating with the Pope for that purpose, announced to the Diet at Augsburg, that a Council would meet within six months, or, at the latest, a year.

It was known that the Landgrave had long been preparing for war, and now the Catholics, seriously alarmed at his abrupt departure from the Diet, prevailed on the Emperor to attempt a reconciliation with the Lutherans. But all attempts were vain, each party refusing to give way. On September 22, the recess of the Diet was decreed; the Lutherans were allowed time till the following April (during which they were neither to propagate their faith nor to make proselytes), to decide whether they would return to the Roman Church. These terms they refused to accept, and the Diet was dismissed with the threats of the Emperor.

The hostile attitude which was assumed by the Diet led the Protestants to form, on March 29, 1531, a defensive union known as the *Schmalcaldic League*, from which the Swiss Reformers were excluded, the contracting parties binding themselves for six

years to stand together in case of any one of them being attacked on account of religion. Francis I., King of France, who was glad to favour a powerful alliance against the Emperor, willingly promised his aid.

In October, 1531, Zwingli, the Swiss Reformer, fell in the Battle of Cappel, of which an account will be given later on. In December of the same year, Œcolampadius died, his work being carried on by Bullinger, who, like Luther, had married a nun.

The Emperor, having first in vain attempted to create dissensions amongst the Schmalcaldic League, afterwards tried to conciliate the Protestants, and, in July, 1532, the *Religious Peace of Nuremberg* was concluded. The Lutherans were allowed complete freedom of worship, till such time as a Council could be assembled, both Catholics and Lutherans binding themselves to united action against the Turks.

In August of the same year, John the Elector of Saxony died, and was succeeded by John Frederic, at that time twenty-nine years of age, and an equally enthusiastic supporter of Luther.

Before the end of the same year, the Emperor succeeded, by means of a threat that he would himself hold a national Council in Germany, in eliciting a promise from the Pope that he would hold a Council. The Emperor doubted whether he would fulfil his promise, and his doubts proved to be true. In 1534, Pope Clement, having the support of the King of France, who was again meditating hostilities against the Empire, announced that the Council would not be convened. On September 25, the Pope died, and was succeeded by Cardinal Alexander Farnese, a man of profligate character, who not only had several illegitimate children, but appointed two of his young illegitimate sons to the Cardinalate. He took the title of Paul III. (1534—1549); we must give him his due; he was liberal, and on that account beloved in Rome.

The new Pope, recognising the need of reform, was willing that a Council should be held, so long as it was held in Italy, and appointed a committee, amongst whom were Sadolet, Contarini, Reginald Pole, and Caraffa (the future Paul IV.), to draw up a scheme for reforming the Church, particularly the Roman Curia. He sent his envoy, Vergerio, into Germany to propose Mantua as the place of meeting; the place, however, was rejected by fifteen Protestant Princes of the Empire, assembled in a Diet at Schmalcald in December, 1535, who refused to acknowledge any Council held in Italy, or presided over by the Pope. And their objection was supported by the ambassadors of France and England at the Court of the Emperor.

The Pope, notwithstanding, adhered to Mantua, and in June, 1536, issued a Bull convening thither a Council on May 23, 1537. But the Protestant Princes, in another Diet at Schmalcald, renewed the same objections, as also did Henry VIII.

The Pope next, in October, 1537, issued another Bull for a Council at Vicenza, for May 1, 1538, and when no Bishops presented themselves, another Bull with no better results for a Council to meet in the same place on Easter-Day, 1539. Next, in June, 1539, he postponed the Council indefinitely.

In 1536 the *First Helvetic Confession*, containing the faith of the Swiss on the chief essential points of doctrine, was formulated, and by their request communicated through Bucer to Luther. Luther had by that time arrived at a more peaceful temper, and a toleration of, although not union with, the Swiss, was effected by the *Concord of Wittenberg*.

After the Religious Peace of Nuremberg, the Protestants enjoyed a long and uninterrupted period of peace and progress. In 1535, the Elector of Brandenburg, who had been the bitter opponent of Luther and of the German Reformation, died. His sons, amongst whom his dominions were divided, although not members of the Schmalcaldic League, adopted Protestantism, and introduced it into their territories. In 1537 the Schmalcaldic

League was renewed. In 1539 Duke George of Saxony, whose daughter the late Elector of Brandenburg had married, and who had also been one of Luther's most violent opponents, died. His brother Henry, who succeeded him, and who was a member of the Schmalcaldic League, and had already introduced the Reformation into Freiburg, now introduced it into Leipsic and Dresden. Vergerio also, whom Paul III. had in 1535 employed as his Legate in Germany, and who had an interview with Luther at Wittenberg on the subject of a proposed Council, some years afterwards himself became a Protestant.

In April, 1541, a Diet met at Regensburg (*Ratisbon*), with the view of effecting a reconciliation between the Catholics and Protestants. The Pope, who now recognised the importance of the Lutheran movement, and the impossibility of suppressing it, sent to the Diet, as his Legate and plenipotentiary, Cardinal Contarini, one of the most learned men of the Roman Church, and well-disposed to the Lutheran doctrine of Justification by Faith. The Catholics were ready to make concessions. The Emperor was present at the Diet, in which, amongst those who represented the Catholic party, was the notorious Eck (who, however, was obliged to retire through illness,) whilst the Protestants were represented by Melancthon and Bucer. The difficulty with regard to Justification was through the Lutherans insisting on Justification *alone* without works, whilst the Catholic contention was for Justification by Faith accompanied by love. The Decree of the Council is known as the *Interim of Ratisbon*, the term signifying that it was to hold good till the assembling of a Council. An agreement between Catholics and Protestants was arrived at in four points,—the Condition of man before the Fall, Original Sin, Free Will, and Justification by Faith alone;—but on such other points as Church Government, the marriage of the Clergy, and Papal authority, the parties remained as far asunder as they were before. The Emperor on dissolving the Diet announced his intention of summoning a Council; the Protestant party

insisting that they would recognise no Council summoned or presided over by the Pope.

In 1542, the Pope sent his Legate, the Bishop of Modena, to a Diet at Spire, presided over by Ferdinand, who had himself proposed Trent in the Tyrol, to announce his intention of summoning a Council to Trent, that being neutral ground between Germany and Italy. The Catholics accepted the locality, but the Protestant Princes objected, on the ground that it was too near Italy, and too much under the Pope's influence.

In the same year Francis, King of France, again declared war against the Emperor. In a Diet at Spire, it was resolved that the Peace of Nuremberg, which had been ratified at Regensburg, should be renewed, and in so favourable a light did the Protestants regard the attitude of the Emperor, that they were induced to join him against the King of France. Henry VIII. also joined the Emperor, and Francis was forced, in 1544, to accept the Peace of Crispy.

The Emperor who being now left at peace was determined to apply himself more than ever to the extermination of heresy, prevailed upon the Pope to summon the Council, which eventually opened at Trent in December, 1545. Ferdinand acting for the Emperor insisted on the Protestants submitting their differences to the Council. The Lutherans, however, refused to have anything to do with the Council, on the ground that the Pope had already prejudged the case and decided against them, and therefore was not a proper person to sit in judgment upon them. The Emperor, who was highly offended, now prepared for war, and concluded a treaty with the Pope; the Schmalcaldic League making similar preparations.

On February 18, 1546, Luther died at Eisleben in his sixty-third year, two months after the opening of the Council of Trent, and less than a year before the death of Henry VIII. In the summer of the same year the Schmalcaldic War broke out, which ended in the battle of Mühlberg on the Elbe, in

the utter defeat of the Lutherans, and the annihilation of the Schmalcaldic League.

In the same year, Herman, the Elector-Archbishop of Cologne, by birth Count von Wied, who, acting under the advice of Melanchthon and Bucer, had endeavoured to introduce the Reformation into his Diocese, was deposed, and retired to his family estates. Two years previously the Bishop of Münster, a man of indifferent character, but who had done good service in suppressing the Anabaptists in the city, had joined the Schmalcaldic League.

In a Diet assembled at Augsburg in July, 1547, the Emperor attempted another reunion of the Church; and in May, 1548, a second, or the *Augsburg Interim*, consisting of twenty-six Articles, was drawn up. All the distinctive claims of Rome were conceded; a provisional allowance of the Marriage of the Clergy, and Communion in Both Kinds being allowed to the Lutherans; and the Interim was gradually accepted by the Lutheran States.

In the same year a Third Interim was drawn up in a Diet at Leipsic (hence called the *Leipsic Interim*), which was accepted by Melanchthon, who had succeeded Luther as leader of the Protestants. The practices sanctioned in the Diet were mostly considered of an indifferent (*ἀδιάφορα*) character. A large party of the Lutherans, however, did not consider them in that light, and thence arose the *Adiaphoristic Controversy*, and a violent onslaught, in which Calvin (of whom we shall hear more a little further on), joined, was made against Melanchthon. In the same year Melanchthon refused an invitation to go to England, as he determined to remain at his post and face his opponents.

In 1549 Pope Paul III. died and was succeeded by Julius III.

In 1552, Maurice, the new Elector of Saxony, who was now the champion of Protestantism, defeated in battle the Emperor Charles, and the treaty of Passau, by which religious toleration was granted to the Protestants, was concluded between him and

the Emperor's brother, Ferdinand. Into Maurice's character we need not stop to enquire, but it has been variously represented; his short career was however of infinite importance, as decisive of the fortunes of the German Reformation. The treaty of Passau was followed (although it was not made till after Maurice's death, which occurred in July, 1553,) by the *Religious Peace of Augsburg*, which was signed on September 25, 1555. It obtained alike for Romanists and the adherents of the Augsburg Confession, full and undisturbed freedom of worship; neither party was allowed to disturb the other; no State might force its religion on another State. Lutherans were also put on the same political footing as other subjects of the Empire, and were admitted as members of the Imperial Chamber. The privileges, however, were confined to the adherents of the Augsburg Confession, and did not extend to the followers of Zwingli's or Calvin's doctrines; but the Religious Peace inaugurated the triumph of the German Reformation.

Melanchthon died A.D. 1560.

The opinions of Luther early found an entrance into France, and in 1521 were condemned by the Faculty of Theology in Paris. The translation of the Bible into French, during the reign of Francis I., by two students of the University of Paris, favoured the Reformation.

The Reformers also found several influential supporters, chief amongst whom were Marguerite of Valois, sister of the King, who in 1527 became Queen of Navarre (she died 1549), and her daughter, Jeanne d'Albret, who had been carefully educated in the reforming doctrines by her mother. The latter married Antoine de Bourbon, Duke of Vendome, who through her became King of Navarre, whom she induced to accept the reformed faith; by him she became the mother of the future King

of France, Henry IV. To these must be added Louis, Duke of Condé, the brother of Antoine, and the three brothers Coligny, one of whom, though a Cardinal of Rome, was favourably affected to the doctrines of the Reformers.

Calvin, the Swiss Reformer, was a native of France, and first imbibed his reforming principles in Paris. Those who held his opinions in France were called (or rather nicknamed) Huguenots, a name derived from the Eidgenossen (*eid*, oath, and *genossen*, confederates), which latter was a League formed against the Dukes of Austria by the people of Scwyz, Uri, and Unterwalden, and which was eventually merged in that of *Swiss*, a title strictly belonging to the inhabitants of the first of the three Cantons.

The Dukes of Guise were the Champions of the Popes against the Huguenots. Mary of Lorraine, daughter of the first Duke of Guise, married James V. of Scotland, and became the mother of Mary Stuart, the unfortunate Queen of Scots.

To understand the progress of the Reformation in France, we must refer again to the civil history of the country at the time.

Francis I., King of France (1515—1547), was, though always defeated by the powerful Emperor, Charles V., great in war, but greater still in peace, a zealous promoter of literature and art; and under him the Renaissance in France made much progress. To him France is indebted for, amongst other works of art, Blois, Fontainebleau, St. Germain's, and Chambord; whilst he was the munificent patron of the great Masters, Raphael, Leonardo da Vinci (who died in his arms), Andrea del Sarto, and Benevuto Cellini.

Although a Catholic, his religious opinions were greatly influenced by his pious sister, Marguerite, to whom he was sincerely attached; and, on the whole, he was inclined to toleration. But his conduct was guided by political considerations, and was subservient to the attitude of the Emperor and the Popes, and in a lesser degree of that of Henry VIII. of England. At one time, as in 1534, he was forced (although it was done with much

cruelty) to suppress the fanatics, who, in their opposition to the Mass and Transubstantiation, imitated, in Paris, the Anabaptist insurgents of Münster. Shortly afterwards, in anticipation of renewed war with the Emperor, he courted the alliance of the Lutheran Princes of Germany, and even of the Infidel Turks, against the Emperor and the Pope. And again, by the Peace of Crispy in 1544, the year before the meeting of the Council of Trent, he bound himself to assist the Emperor in suppressing the Reformers, and establishing the old faith. The last years of his life were spent in a bitter persecution, and a violent reaction against the Protestants only terminated with his death, A.D. 1547.

His son and successor, Henry II. (1547—1559), had, A.D. 1533, married the famous Catherine de' Medici (1519—1589), niece of Pope Clement VII., and by her he became the father of his three weak successors on the throne; whilst one of their daughters married the bigoted Philip II. of Spain, another Henry of Navarre, the future Henry IV.

Catharine, who had been neglected and kept in the background by her husband, during his lifetime, came to the front after his death, and, under her three incompetent sons, was virtually regent of the Kingdom. Two rival religious parties existed, the Catholic party, as above mentioned, under the Duke of Guise, and the Huguenots, under Antoine de Bourbon, King of Navarre, each of whom thought he was entitled to the throne in the event of the failure of the reigning line. It was the policy of Catharine to keep an evenly-poised balance between the two parties, and she exerted herself to exalt and depress the one or the other, according to the dictates of her own personal ambition.

The Court of France was, under her direction, excessively gay and brilliant, the daytime devoted to hunting and garden parties; or, if the ladies were confined to the house, to listening, amidst their embroidery and needlework, to songs sung by the gentlemen of the Court, of romance and love; whilst the evenings

were spent at balls or theatres. Such a pleasurable life was less adapted than that of the phlegmatic Germans, to imbibe the sober and stern principles of the reformer, and the ground was ill-suited to receive the seeds of the Reformation ; so that the religious question turned on a political and personal, rather than on a religious pivot, and gave rise to protracted civil wars

Francis II. (1559—1560) succeeded his father on the throne of France. He had, when Dauphin, at the age of fifteen, married, on April 24 of the previous year, Mary, Queen of Scots, and was by the marriage entirely brought under the influence of the Guises, and became an opponent of the Huguenots.

The failure of an attempt, attributed to the Condés, to seize the young King in the Castle of Amboise, and to destroy the Guises, which led the Catholics to take a fearful vengeance, caused the temporary unpopularity of the Huguenots, and strengthened the hands of the Duke of Guise. The Queen-mother, thinking that popularity would render that family more powerful than suited her, swerved round to the side of the Huguenots, and appointed the famous and patriotic Michael de l'Hopital, a favourer of the Huguenots, Chancellor of the Kingdom.

Elated with this unexpected success, and stung to vengeance by the cruelty inflicted on their co-religionists at Amboise, the Huguenots retaliated, and wreaked their vengeance on their opponents by profaning the Churches, and destroying the Altars and Images.

On December 5, 1560, the young King, after a reign of scarcely eighteen months, died, and was succeeded by his brother, Charles IX. (1560—1574), a boy little more than ten years of age.

In January, 1562, under the auspices of Catharine, the first edict of toleration of the Huguenots was published at St. Germain's, on the condition of their restoring the Churches which they had seized, and respecting the faith of the Catholics.

Events, however, had gone too far to prevent the outbreak, in

the same year, of civil war. Our limits confine us to a few of the principal events. The Huguenots made Orleans the basis of their operations. In October, the King of Navarre, who had now been persuaded to join the Catholics, was killed whilst besieging Rouen. In February, 1563, the Duke of Guise, whilst besieging Orleans, was assassinated by a fanatical Huguenot.

In 1564 Catharine was visited at Bayonne by her daughter Elizabeth (who in 1559 married Philip II., King of Spain), and by the Spanish minister, the bloody Duke of Alva; and by them she was persuaded to go over to the Catholics, and to work for the extermination of the Huguenots.

Soon afterwards a religious war occurred in the Netherlands. By the death of Charles the Bold, the last Duke of Burgundy, in 1477, in battle with the Swiss, the Dukedom of Burgundy, including the Netherlands, had by the marriage of his only child Mary to the Emperor, Maximilian I., become an appendage of Germany^d. Under Maximilian's successor, Charles V., Protestantism had been firmly embraced in the Netherlands. The bigoted tyrant, Philip II., the son and successor of Charles in Spain, having determined to extirpate the Protestants, sent Alva into the country; a cruel persecution, in which the Inquisition was freely resorted to, ensued, the noblest men in the country, and amongst them the Counts Egmont and Horn, falling under the axe of the executioner.

When news of this fearful onslaught on their brethren reached France, the Huguenots, believing that the late interview at Bayonne boded a similar persecution to themselves, resolved to break the truce which had lately existed; and the civil war was renewed. In November the Constable Montmorency, on the side of the Catholics, fell at Montcontour; and in March, 1569, Condé, on the side of the Huguenots, was killed at Jarnac. But the Huguenots, although beaten at all points, still held out under Coligny, the Catholics being headed by Henry, Duke of Guise.

The war having lasted beyond Catharine's expectations, it

^d See p. 554.

now became her policy to favour the Huguenots, who by a treaty signed at St. Germain's in August, 1570, were, with the exception of Paris, allowed the free exercise of their religion in all parts of the kingdom, and were put on an equality with the Catholics in regard to all public offices and employments. She also resolved on the marriage of her daughter, Marguerite of Valois, with Henry, the Protestant King of Navarre.

Such a marriage, however, agreed little with the views of the conscientious Jeanne d'Albret, who had educated her son in the strict principles of Protestantism. She, however, not without suspicion of poison administered by the Queen-mother, died in Paris early in 1572. The marriage was celebrated on August 18. Six days later occurred the massacre of St. Bartholomew's.

The King, influenced by a deep reverence for Admiral Coligny, had lately been drawn over to the side of the Huguenots. This change in his religion created a feeling, on the part of the Guises and Catharine, against the Reformers. It was at a time when a large number of Huguenots had come to Paris to witness the marriage of the Huguenot King of Navarre; and the Duke of Guise thought it a favorable opportunity for avenging the assassination of his father. The King was induced by Catharine to believe that Coligny had conspired against his life. At two o'clock in the morning of St. Bartholomew's Day, the great bell of the Church of St. Germain L'Auxerrois in Paris rung out the preconcerted signal; and every Huguenot, without regard to station, or sex, or age, from Coligny, the first victim, who was killed whilst kneeling in prayer at his bedside, were ruthlessly murdered. The same hideous work was carried on for three days in various cities of the kingdom; how many thousands were slain it is impossible to say; but the Catholics thought their work complete, and Catharine is said to have witnessed the tragedy from a window in the Louvre. At Rome the Pope ordered public thanks to be offered up, a solemn *Te Deum* sung, and a medal to be cast in commemoration of the event. Charles

repented when it was too late, and died, worn out with grief, on May 30, 1574.

The Huguenots, however, were far from crushed. Henry III. (1574—1589), the last of the House of Valois, a man, who with his many other vices, combined an extreme superstition, succeeded his brother, and at once announced his hostile intentions against the Huguenots. The Guises being now all-powerful in Paris, Henry, Duke of Guise, formed, A.D. 1576, ostensibly for the defence of the Church, but principally for his own aggrandisement, the *Catholic League*. The King of France being childless, to exclude from the throne the next in succession, the Huguenot King of Navarre, and to ensure it for himself, was his real object.

In 1587 tidings reached Paris that Mary, Queen of Scots, had perished in England on the scaffold. The King of France, without any show of reason, was accused of being an accomplice in the crime, and against him the fury of the League was turned. In December, 1588, the Duke of Guise was, at the instigation of the King, assassinated in the Palace of Blois; and the murder of his brother, the Cardinal of Lorraine, soon afterwards followed. The murders so infuriated the League, that the King was forced to seek refuge in the camp of his former enemy, Henry of Navarre, with whom he resolved to attack Paris.

In January, 1589, Catharine de' Medici died. In August of the same year Henry III. was murdered by a monk, named Clement. Thus the line of Valois became extinct. The Huguenot King of Navarre, who was at the time under the ban of excommunication from the Pope, became the first in order of the Bourbon Kings of France, under the title of Henry IV. (1589—1610).

The reign of Henry IV. was the great turning-point of the Reformation in France. Although, for political ends, and acting under the advice of his capable minister, the famous

Duke of Sully, who was himself a Calvinist, he was induced, in 1593, to abandon the Huguenots and join the Church of Rome ; yet in April, 1598, he subscribed the Edict of Nantes, the charter of toleration of the Huguenots, whereby they were accorded freedom of worship, and placed under the same civil and religious rights as the Catholics.

The Lutheran movement was far outstripped in both doctrinal and disciplinary thoroughness by that in Switzerland. The Swiss Reformation, of which Zwingli and Calvin were the principal authors, received its first impulse from Luther.

Ulrich Zwingli (1484—1531), the first of the two in point of time, was born at Wildhaus, like Luther, of humble, but not poor, parentage ; and having received a good classical foundation at Basle and Berne, went, at the age of fifteen, to the University of Vienna ; and having finished, in 1506, his University course at Basle, was ordained Priest at Constance, and became Curate of Glarus. Here he threw off the remains of his early Scholasticism, and not troubling himself about the Fathers of the Church, studied Greek, with the view, as he himself said, of properly understanding the New Testament. In 1512, and again in 1515, he acted as Chaplain to the Swiss Forces ; and, resigning his Curacy at Glarus, where his conduct was not marked by strict morality, he became for two years Curate of Einsiedeln, the famous resort of pilgrims. Here he began to exhibit his reforming tendencies, telling the people that they must not expect forgiveness through pilgrimages and outward observances, but by true repentance. In 1519 Zurich became the scene of his reforming labours, and he instituted a course of preaching, at that time unusual, in the Cathedral, of a connected series of sermons on the New Testament. He adopted the Bible as the sole staple of his preaching ; but, unlike Luther,

who retained the doctrines of the Church unless they were contrary to the Bible, he discarded everything which the Bible does not expressly enjoin.

In August, 1518, one Sampson, a Franciscan monk, arrived in Switzerland, as hawker of the Papal Indulgences. The Swiss people, like the Germans, formed the logical conclusion, that if the Popes had the power of releasing them, "they were the greatest scoundrels" to leave any souls in Purgatory; and Zwingle, when he arrived at Zurich, easily prevailed with the Council to expel Sampson from the city.

At Zurich the new teaching met with much opposition, and Zwingle's life was in danger. But he having in 1523 drawn up a Confession of Faith, the Council decreed that a public discussion should be held between him and his ecclesiastical opponents. The result was the triumph of the Reformation, for the Council determined that he and his followers had not been convicted of error, and therefore that they might continue to preach the Gospel as they had hitherto done. Soon the Reformation spread, not only in Zurich, but in other Cantons also. In 1524 the Mass was abolished; Latin was superseded by the vernacular language; the Holy Eucharist was celebrated in Both Kinds; the Marriage of the Clergy was permitted; Monks and Nuns were released from their vows, and the property of the Convents was sequestrated for the purposes of education.

We have already marked the difference which existed between Luther and Zwingle as to the mode of the Presence in the Holy Communion. Luther believed in a Corporal Presence, Zwingle adopted the lowest possible view of the Sacrament. He held, that the Eucharist was the mere sign, or external symbol of Christianity, just as the dress of the Swiss was the badge which distinguished them from other nations; the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood was to him no more than the common elements which were eaten and drunk.

We need not enter into Zwingle's conception of Church and State, nor his idea of combining in his own person the office of a Political, as well as Ecclesiastical, Reformer. Suffice it to say that it cost him his life. His chief opponents were the four Forest Cantons, Lucerne, Zug, Uri, and Unterwalden. Zwingle held that conformity ought to be, and could only be, enforced by the sword, and that it was his duty, as "a faithful watchman," to take part in a religious war. The result was that, in October, 1531, the forces of Zurich were defeated by the four Cantons in the battle of Cappel, and Zwingle lost his life.

Geneva was, with Wittenberg and Zurich, the chief birth-place of the Protestant Reformation.

Francis Bonivard, Prior of St. Victor's at Geneva, the famous prisoner (1530—1536) of Chillon, has been claimed by some as the reformer of Geneva; but, says Hagenbach, he was a Schoolman and satirist; and although he attacked the abuses of Rome, he did it from caprice rather than principle.

We must also pass by William Farel, a Frenchman, who had been forced to leave France on account of his reforming principles; and also his pupil Peter Viret (both of whom attacked the Roman usages, and preached, in 1534, the reforming doctrines in French-speaking Switzerland), and come to the great Genevan reformer, Calvin.

John Chauvin (1509—1564), or, in the Latin form of his name, Calvin, was a native of Noyons, in Picardy, educated in the Universities of Orleans and Bruges, where he entirely threw off his Scholasticism, devoting himself to Theology and to the study of Greek and Hebrew, with the view of a thorough understanding of the Bible. At twelve years of age, in accordance with a bad custom of the times, he received a Church Benefice. After his conversion, which he attributed to a sudden call from God, breaking away from the old Faith, he joined the small party of reformers at Paris, but getting into trouble

on account of his religious opinions, he was obliged to fly from the city. In 1535 he arrived at Basle, where he met Bucer, and in the following year published his *Institutes* (*Institutio Christianæ Religionis*), a system of Theology which thenceforward became, and long remained, the authoritative standard of *Reformed* Theology. In it he propounds his views of the Holy Eucharist, with respect to which he took up an intermediate position, holding a real Spiritual Presence in the Eucharist, as distinct from the corporal Presence held by Luther, and the mere commemorative rite of Zwingle.

Being prevented by the war between the Emperor and France from going, as he had intended, to Germany, he went, A.D. 1536, to Geneva, where the preaching of the Gospel had already been legalised by a decree of the Grand Council in the previous year. Here he set himself up as a veritable Pope, not only interfering, with great severity, in the vices of the people (and they certainly required the pruning-knife of the reformer), but also in their innocent pleasures and recreations, and even in the fashion of dress amongst the females. The consequence was that he met with such a storm of opposition, that he was compelled, in 1538, to leave the city, and accepting a call from Bucer went to Strasburg, where he was appointed Professor of Theology, and was employed in editing his *Commentaries*. At that time he was an admirer of Luther, and was even accused by the Swiss of Lutheranism. At Strasburg he married.

An attempt having been made, during his absence from Geneva, to reclaim the Church to the old Faith, Calvin's growing fame induced the majority of the Genevese to recall the Reformer; Calvin in consequence, on September 13, 1541, returned to Geneva, where he resided till his death. There he established his peculiar form of Religion, which after him has ever since been known as Calvinism; or the *Reformed* faith, as distinct from Lutheranism; to which latter the term Protestantism (although that term has since been adopted to include

those faiths of Western Christendom which differ from Rome) strictly belongs.

Predestination was the key-note not only of Calvinism (for we are willing to believe that his followers carried his teaching to an extreme which he never intended), but of Calvin himself. We are not all, he says, born under the same conditions, but to some eternal life, to others eternal death, is predestinated; God Himself decreed Adam's fall. Many are excluded from all hope of eternal life. The judgment, he says, is beyond our understanding, but it only adds to the Glory of God. If God's mercy in saving some is inscrutable, how can any complain of His condemning others?

We may here enunciate the five distinctive points of Calvinism as held by Calvin and his followers ever since his time:—

1. Predestination (including Election to eternal life, and Reprobation); viz., that God before the foundation of the world foreordained, irrespective of anything which they themselves can do, the fate of the just and the reprobate.

(2) Particular Redemption, i.e., that Christ died only for a part of mankind.

(3) Original Sin, or the doctrine that the Fall of man was such that not one spark of moral goodness is left in him. With regard to the Fall of Adam, the Calvinists were divided into two parties, one the Sublapsarians, who held that Adam fell through his own will; the other, the Supralapsarians, that he fell by the Will of God. The orthodox doctrine of the Church is, that Regeneration, or a New Birth, is conferred in Baptism, whereby the guilt of Original Sin is remitted, although the infection of Nature still remains, even in the regenerate. Calvin held that of the New Birth the Elect alone are partakers.

(4) Irresistible Grace, as opposed to Free Will.

(5) Final Perseverance.

Calvin, with the help of Bullinger, consolidated the Swiss Reformation, which became the model of the Independent and

Presbyterian systems. Spiritual government was vested by him, not in an individual, but in bodies, (the latter composed half of Clergy, half of Laity,) and the Consistory, of which he was President, which was entirely guided by him, and over which he exercised the strictest moral and ecclesiastical discipline.

As a Theologian he knew no cotemporary superior. His gloomy disposition reflected itself in his religious services. He rejected all ceremonial worship. The Churches were left bare of ornament, everything being removed that could create religious impression through the ear or eye. No singing, except one hymn before, and one after, the sermon; no Christian seasons, except just one in the week, Sunday, and that observed with a meagre simplicity.

He was a man of many virtues; rigid and austere in life; thoroughly disinterested with regard to money, content, when he might have been a rich man, with just sufficient to live upon, so that at his death all his property, including his books, amounted to one hundred and twenty-five crowns. But we must look to the other side of the picture. Besides the gloominess of his disposition, which made him a stranger to friendship, he was a thorough bigot; impatient of contradiction, implacable as an opponent; whilst his conduct towards Servetus was cruel and treacherous, and has left an indelible stain on his name.

The Protestants had to learn that liberty of conscience is the birth-right of every man, for which he is responsible to God alone. Hatred of Roman Catholics was the badge of the Protestant reformers. Toleration, which they thought due to themselves, was not a virtue which they themselves practised. Servetus had attacked the doctrine of the Trinity in a book which he wrote, not in Geneva, but in France. He had corresponded as a friend with Calvin, and Calvin violated his confidence. When Servetus was, on his road to Naples, passing through Geneva, he was arrested; and on Calvin's accu-

sation, and on his refusing to recant, he was, A.D. 1553, consigned to the flames. That four of Calvin's followers were burnt in France about the same time does not palliate the crime.

It is scarcely necessary to point out the erroneousness of Calvin's teaching. If God, Who is omnipotent, had, irrespective of anything they do or can do, designed some to eternal misery, then God, Who we are told throughout the Bible is a God of love, would be the Author of sin. Nor is man so bad as Calvin would make him out to be. Though he is born in sin, God has appointed many means for his recovery ; the earliest of which is Baptism, to give him a New Birth. Then come the Eucharist and other means of grace, to support the new life which Baptism has given. Few are so bad but that the spark of grace remains, and can be fanned again into life, so that where sin abounds, grace abounds still more.

Calvin died A.D. 1564, three years before Melancthon. Martin Bucer had died in 1550. All the principal early Reformers were now dead, with the exception of Bullinger, who lived till 1575. Calvin's work was carried on by Theodore Beza (1519—1605), like himself a Frenchman, born in Burgundy. Beza, a learned Greek scholar, first became Professor of Greek at Lausanne ; from 1559 he took up his residence in Geneva, devoting himself to literature, and in one of his books defended the burning of Servetus ; and as the successor of Calvin, whose principles he followed with enthusiasm, he exercised a no less autocratic sway than his predecessor.

The Reformer of Scotland was John Knox (1505—1572), who introduced into the country Calvinism under its most rigid and gloomy form. The Reformation had been first taught in the country, under the form of Lutheranism, by Patrick Hamilton, who died a martyr to his opinions, A.D. 1528 ; and in 1535 an

Act of Parliament was passed against those who taught "the damnable opinions of the great heretic, Luther."

George Wishart, a native of Glasgow, and graduate of Cambridge, having in his travels in Germany been indoctrinated with Lutheranism, on his return to Scotland, in 1544, preached against the corruptions of the Roman Church. This brought upon him the wrath of Cardinal Beaton, Archbishop of St. Andrew's, who promoted a violent persecution against the Scotch Reformers; and Wishart, being condemned for heresy, was, in 1546, burnt at St. Andrew's. Beaton reaped as he had sown, and was himself murdered in the same year by a band of zealots, who assumed to themselves the duty of executing judgment on notorious violators of the laws of God and society.

John Knox, born in Gifford in East Lothian, and educated in the University of Glasgow under John Mair, a celebrated Schoolman, and ordained in his twenty-fourth year, became imbued with the teaching of Wishart, and, being in danger for his opinions, sought, in 1547, a refuge amongst the murderers of Beaton in the Castle of St. Andrew's, whence, when it was stormed by the French, he was carried away prisoner to Rouen, and remained a convict in their galleys, compelled to labour at the oar, till 1549. Repairing, after his release, to England, he was, A.D. 1552, appointed Chaplain to Edward VI., and is said, on account of his objection to Prelacy and the English Prayer-Book, to have refused the Bishopric of Rochester.

Shortly after the accession of Mary to the throne of England, he sought refuge in Geneva, where he made the acquaintance of Calvin and Beza, and then became for some time Chaplain to the English refugees at Frankfort, and recrossed the Channel in 1555. His time was now spent between Geneva, where he became thoroughly indoctrinated in Calvinism, and Scotland. He had drifted into a religious and civil Socialism, and in 1558 wrote from Geneva a scurrilous pamphlet, entitled *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*, directed

especially against Mary of England and Mary of Lorraine, the mother of Mary Queen of Scots, who had in 1554 supplanted the Earl of Arran in the Regency of Scotland.

In 1559 he bade a final adieu to Geneva, and settled down in Scotland. Here he carried out the principles of Calvin with a rigid fanaticism ; he preached a fiery sermon at Perth against Rome, the idolatry of the Mass, and the veneration of Saints ; a riot followed, in which the Monasteries of the Dominican and Franciscan Friars and the Carthusian monks were destroyed ; and, if not immediately through him, yet as a consequence of his teaching, the fanatical populace thought it their duty, in order to eradicate idolatry, to withstand the government of the country. The Queen Regent determined to quell the riots by force of arms ; the Protestants formed a bond or Covenant, and began to be distinguished by the name of *Congregation*, and their leaders to be termed *Lords of the Congregation*.

In 1560 the Lords of the Congregation entered Edinburgh, and the flames of Civil war were kindled ; Romanism was abolished, attendance at Mass rendered penal, and the Reformation established by Act of Parliament. The *Confession of Faith and Doctrine*, which was drawn up by the Protestants, was followed by the *First Book of Discipline* ; the English Prayer-Book was superseded by the Order of Geneva, and Superintendants were appointed in the place of Bishops. On December 20, the first General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland was held in Edinburgh. Such was the state of things when, on August 19, 1561, after a Regency of nearly twenty years, the young widowed Queen Mary, a thorough Catholic, landed from France in Scotland. Everything was against her. She had been Queen of France, and French troops had only recently been removed from Edinburgh. She brought with her French attendants and French courtiers. She was consequently regarded rather as a foreigner than a Scotch woman. Even the bigoted Philip II. of Spain, who might have been expected to be her

friend, looked upon her with suspicion, and dreaded an alliance between France and Scotland, which he hated even more than the Reformation in England. She was also an object of suspicion to Elizabeth of England, whose right to the throne was doubtful, whilst Mary's right of succession, at any rate after Elizabeth's death, undoubted. She was young and beautiful, and fond of amusements; doubtless also, frivolous; and such things were hateful to the sour-tempered Calvinists.

John Knox immediately proceeded to preach against her, and a few days after her arrival the services at Holyrood were broken in upon and interrupted by the fanatical Protestants.

In 1564 Knox contracted a second marriage with a daughter of Lord Ochiltree, who was connected with the royal blood of Scotland.

In July, 1565, the *Book of Common Order* finally superseded the English Prayer-Book. On the same day the Queen celebrated her unfortunate marriage with her cousin, Lord Darnley. The fury of the Congregation was redoubled by the indiscreet choice, as her secretary and confidant, of the Roman Catholic Rizzio, whose appearance alone was sufficient to stultify any charge of undue familiarity which the Calvinistic preachers brought against her. In March, 1566, Rizzio was murdered, not without the approval of her husband, by some Scotch Lords. Three months afterwards, her son, the future James I. of England and James VI. of Scotland, was born. Into the matter of Darnley's murder, which took place in February, 1567, and of which she was accused; her union with Bothwell; the Regency and assassination of her illegitimate brother, Moray, and her dethronement, it is beyond our province to enter. On April 7 the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, and Primate of Scotland, was executed on a charge of complicity in Darnley's murder.

Of some of these important events Knox was no disinterested witness. He preached the sermon at the Coronation, in 1567,

of James VI. He lived long enough to hear of the massacre of St. Bartholomew's, and died in November, 1572. They buried him in the Churchyard of St. Giles', Edinburgh, the Regent Morton pronouncing over him the words, "There he lies, who never feared the face of any man."

It cannot be denied to him that, in the path which he considered his duty, he was firm as a rock, and, even when his life was in danger, brave as a lion.

Knox was the leader of a sect which denounced the Episcopal Clergy as "the generation of Antichrist." The Scottish Kirk was governed by Presbyteries and General Assemblies, which sanctioned a Presbyterian government of the Kirk; the Calvinistic Confession of Faith, with the first Book of Discipline, became the standard of Orthodoxy. Episcopacy, however, continued in Scotland till it was abolished, in 1592, by Act of Parliament, and Presbyterianism established.

The Church of England owes one deep debt of gratitude to John Knox; for he succeeded in making Presbyterianism so thoroughly obnoxious, that when James VI. of Scotland became James I. of England, "the wisest fool in Christendom," as people called him, who liked to have his way in every Ecclesiastical question, he had no desire for the importation of Presbyterianism into his new kingdom.

B.—THE ROMAN CATHOLIC REFORMATION.

THE Popes opposed to a Reformation—Lateran Council of 1512—1516—The way prepared for the Reformation—The Oratory of Divine Love—The Capuchins—The Theatines—The Paulines—The Somascenes—The Ursulines—St. Philip of Neri—The Society of Jesus—Ignatius Loyola—St. Francis Xavier—Le Fevre—The vow of the Jesuits—Loyola elected their General—The Inquisition revived in Rome—The Bull *Injunctum Vobis*—Lainez—Rodriguez—The great success of the Jesuits—Xavier, the *Apostle of the Indies*—Opening of the Council of Trent—Its Sessions—Transferred to Bologna—Suppression of the Council for two years—Resumed at Trent—Complaint of the King of France—Questions suggested to the Council from the Emperor and King of France—The Council suspended through the war between France and Germany—No steps taken to convene it during Pontificate of Paul IV.—Pius IV., Pope—St. Carlo Borromeo—The Council re-assembles—Angry debates—Quarrels between the Italians and Spaniards—The Cardinal of Lorraine—Complaints of the Emperor, Ferdinand—The Council hopelessly at variance—The French ambassadors propose its dissolution—The termination of the Council—The Congregation of the Council of Trent—The Index of the Council of Trent—The Creed of Pope Pius IV.—The Catechism of the Council of Trent—New Edition of the Breviary—And of the Missal—And of the Vulgate—New articles of doctrine established by the Council—The Decrees of the Council only partially accepted—The reconciliation of Christendom not effected—The Council not a General one—Reasons of its failure—Result would probably have been different if the votes had been taken by Nations—Great importance of the Council to the Church of Rome—The Reformation of the Council of Trent not Catholic—The Reformation in Ireland—Cromer, Archbishop of Armagh—Brown, Archbishop of Dublin—Henry VIII. declared Head of the Irish Church—Confiscation of the Monasteries—Dowdall succeeds Cromer—Deposed, and Goodacre appointed—Bale, Bishop of Ossory—Ireland reconciled to Rome in reign of Mary—The Reformed Faith restored under Elizabeth—The Pope appoints Bishops in Ireland—Ill feeling of the Irish to the English—Foundation of Trinity College, Dublin.

AT a time when the whole intellectual world was in motion ; when the art of Printing enabled people to know many things of which they were ignorant before ; when they learnt so much of the wicked lives of the Popes, that Religious Romanists themselves began to ask whether the Christianity of the Roman

Church could possibly be the religion of Christ ; when Cardinals and Bishops and Councils declared that the whole Church, from the Pope, the Head, to the members, was thoroughly corrupt ; when the Reformation had made long strides in the greatest part of Germany, in England, in France, in Switzerland, in Holland, in the whole of Scandinavia, and even in Italy and Spain ; when it was an open secret that many professing Roman Clergy were well affected to the Reformation ; when a demand for a Council to reform the corruptions of the Church was echoed by the Emperor, and both Catholic and Protestant Princes, of Germany ;—it was impossible for Rome to stand still.

The Popes, as of old, had continued to bar the way. It could not be expected that Popes like Sixtus IV., or Innocent VIII., or Alexander VI., would be desirous of a reform. To them a genuine reform meant the reform of themselves, probably their own deposition ; as to whether the Church was, or was not, corrupt, it can scarcely be imagined, such men concerned themselves. A Lateran Council (1512—1516) sat in the Pontificates of the warlike Julius II., and the easy-going and magnificent Leo X., but, although the question of reform was brought before it, it met with little response ; and before its close, the Council confirmed the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, that it was necessary for every human being to bow to the supremacy of the Pope.

The Roman Catholic Reformation was effected by the Council of Trent, and by the Jesuits.

But some preliminary movements, in the direction of reform, were made in Rome itself by various Societies and Orders which were founded in the early part of the sixteenth Century. Such was the *Oratory of Divine Love* founded during the Pontificate of Leo, consisting of about sixty members, chief amongst the Oratorians being the future Cardinals, Contarini, Sadoletti, Caraffa, afterwards Paul IV., and Reginald Pole ; amongst whom the

Lutheran doctrine of Justification by Faith held a prominent place.

One of the Orders which sprung up about this time was that of the Capuchins, a reformed branch of the Franciscan Order of the XIIIth Century, which arose in 1525. In 1528 its members obtained from Pope Clement VII. the Bull *Religionis Zelus*, by which they were allowed to call themselves *Hermit Friars Minor*; to live as hermits, to go about bare-footed, and to wear beards, with a hood (*capuccio*), from which they received their nickname, Capuchins. In 1538, and again in 1541, they elected the famous Bernardino Ochino of Siena as their Vicar-General; and by their devoted lives, and their zealous preaching amongst the people, they did a great work amongst the lower classes, bringing back many who had fallen away into the Roman Church. Bernardino Ochino was banished for heresy; and the whole fraternity falling under the imputation, were at one time forbidden to preach, and were in danger of being suppressed; the inhibition, however, was removed in 1545; and by Gregory XIII. (1572—1585) they were allowed to establish monasteries in every part of the world.

But if the Church of Rome was to be reformed, a reformation must be made of the Clergy themselves; and this task presented itself to the minds of two men of widely diverse characters, the gentle Gaetano of Thienne, and the impetuous Caraffa, at that time Bishop of Chiati, or, as it was in the Neopolitan dialect, Theate. By these two, and taking their name from the latter, the Order of Theatines was founded in 1524. Its members were Priests who took the monastic vows, and settled on the Pincian Hill at Rome, where they adopted a life of absolute poverty. Yet they did not style themselves monks, nor assume the monastic garb; but, dressed as ordinary Priests, they engaged themselves in preaching; whilst they established a Theological School for the preparation of Clergy for the Ministry.

Another order was that of the Paulines, or Clerks-regular of

St. Paul, who derived their origin, in 1532, from Milan, and were confirmed by Pope Paul III., A.D. 1538. The Somascenes, so called from Somasca, a village between Milan and Bergamo, were founded by a Venetian nobleman, who devoted his life to the service of the poor and destitute, and founded several hospitals in Italy; they were confirmed, in 1540, by Paul III.

In 1544, the Ursulines, or Nuns of St. Ursula, with whose name is connected the legend of the eleven thousand Virgin martyrs in Cologne Cathedral (a legend perhaps arising from one of the martyrs being named Undecimilla), was confirmed by Paul III. The Sisterhood, which was founded by St. Angela of Brescia, lived in the world, unbound by monastic vows, devoting themselves to the education of children, and to the care of the unfortunates of their own sex.

In 1548 (and therefore after the first meeting of the Council of Trent), the Society of the Holy Trinity was founded at Rome by St. Philip of Neri (1515—1595), a Florentine of noble birth and eminent piety, who also founded a hospice for the purpose of ministering to the wants of strangers and pilgrims; but the society afterwards extended its usefulness, especially to the reformation of the Roman Clergy. St. Philip, from a feeling of his own unworthiness, did not receive Orders till 1551. In that year he founded in Rome, without binding its members to take monastic vows, the *Congregation of the Priests of the Oratory*, the famous Seminary of the Roman Priesthood, of which Baronius (1538—1607, created, A.D. 1595, a Cardinal), the Annalist of the Roman Church, became one of the most distinguished members, and succeeded St. Philip as its Superior. The Society was famous for the cheerfulness employed in its Services and Prayer-meetings, and for the religious music which it adopted; and from them the *Oratorio* derives its name. Gregory XIII. assigned to the Oratorians a Church in Rome for their special services.

But the most remarkable Order of all; the powerful lever

which may almost be said to have saved the Church of Rome ; which counteracted the work of the Reformation ; and not only prevented further losses, but enabled Rome to gain back much that it had lost by the foreign Reformation (for they never obtained a firm footing in England), was the Society of Jesus ; or (as they are generally known) the Jesuits ; whose founder was a Spaniard of noble birth, a native of Loyola, named in Spanish Inigo, but commonly known under its Latin form, Ignatius Loyola (1491—1556).

Loyola, who was born eight years after Luther, was in his youth a soldier, in which capacity he had shown much valour ; but a severe wound, received in the siege of Pampeluna by the French, brought him to the verge of death, and incapacitated him from further service ; this was the turning-point in his life. Whilst confined, through his wound, to his room, he devoted his time to studying the Lives of the Saints ; and, on the recovery of his health, he resolved to emulate the example of SS. Dominic and Francis in striving against evil, and combating heretics and infidels. He took the Mediæval Church as the model, on which he determined to reform the Roman Church, to stifle free enquiry, and to practice and enforce absolute obedience to the Pope.

Retiring for about ten months to the deserts of Monresa, and assuming the dress of a hermit, he devoted himself to a sincere repentance for the past, living a life of extreme austerity, on bread and water, and practising the scourgings of the early monks. In 1523 he started, with the Pope's blessing, dressed in the garb of a pilgrim and begging his way, on a journey to Jerusalem, with the view of comforting the Christians, and converting the infidels in the Holy City.

Leaving Jerusalem, he went, A.D. 1524, with the view of improving his learning, to Spain, where he applied himself to the studies of philosophy and Theology, and on two occasions suffered under the Inquisition on a charge of heresy. He afterwards,

A.D. 1528, went, in order to continue his studies, to Paris. There, about the time that the Diet of Augsburg was sitting, he brought several students under his influence, amongst them Francis Xavier, a native of Navarre, and Pierre le Fevre, a Savoyard, whose rooms he shared, and whom he prevailed on to join him in forming a new Order for counteracting the evils of the times, and stemming the progress of the Reformation. In 1534 they, together with several other friends, repaired to the Abbey of Montmartre, the site of the martyrdom of St. Dionysius (or Denis), the patron saint of France, where they bound themselves to go to the Holy Land, and to undertake any service which the Pope might assign them.

In 1536 the associates again met in Venice, where they were ordained, and Loyola formed an acquaintance with Caraffa and the Theatines, with whose mode of life he was deeply impressed. There, in 1539, they formed the *Society of Jesus*. They bound themselves to a life of implicit obedience to the Pope, to devote themselves to education, to mission-work amongst heretics and heathens, or to any other service which might be ordered. In the next year they laid their plans before the Pope, and succeeded, not without at first some hesitation on his part, in obtaining their Bull of Incorporation, *Regimini Militantis Ecclesiæ*.

Finding that their journey to the Holy Land, owing to the war between the Emperor and the Ottoman Turks, was rendered impracticable, they, A.D. 1541, elected Loyola as their General, with autocratic powers, who then took up his permanent abode in Rome, whence he exercised a higher influence even than the Popes themselves. Here he joined Caraffa in the revival of the Inquisition for the extirpation of heresy, and, although many suffered under it the death of martyrs, the majority of those who had left it were reclaimed to the Roman Church.

In 1543 the Pope, by the Bull *Injunctum Vobis*, withdrew the limitation to the number of sixty, which had been imposed upon them by the first Bull; and further privileges were conferred

on them in 1545 and 1549. The Order was exempted from all Spiritual Rule, except that of the Popes ; they were allowed to preach in all churches, to hear confessions, and to grant Absolution for such sins, of which the pardon had hitherto been confined to the Popes alone.

The progress which the Order made in Europe was immense. Preaching, like the mendicants before them, in the streets and market-places, in houses, and in hospitals ; but interesting themselves principally in schemes of education and learning, and founding colleges and schools ; the benefit they conferred on the Church of Rome was incalculable. Nor were their labours confined to Italy under Loyola. A similar work was carried on in Germany by Lainez, intellectually the Superior of Loyola, by Le Fevre in Madrid, and Rodriquez in Lisbon, whilst other Missionaries were despatched to Ireland. Europe, Africa, and India, were soon portioned out into provinces under Jesuit guidance. Opposition they met with, but in spite of all, and the relapse of many of his followers, the Order had, before the death of the Founder, widely spread over the world, and obtained the support of the leading Princes of Europe. The Jesuits were looked upon as the champions of the Church ; colleges were richly endowed ; Ignatius had, before his death, founded more than a hundred training colleges, and his Order numbered a thousand members. He died in 1556. Within ten years after his death, the Jesuits had effectually counteracted the spread of Protestantism in Germany. It is not too much to say that no religious Institution ever equalled in the results which it accomplished, the Order founded by Ignatius. He was canonised by Gregory XV.

Francisco Xavier (1506 – 1552), which latter name he received from his native place at the foot of the Pyrenees, a Spaniard of noble birth, was the great missionary of the Society, and is known as the *Apostle of the Indies*. He was brought, as we have seen, when a student at the University of Paris, under the

influence of Loyola, who, when the mind of Xavier was set on worldly projects and on earthly grandeur, reminded him again and again of the text, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul." In 1542 he went as a missionary to India and the Indian Islands, where he converted many Jews and Mahometans, and established a Jesuit College at Goa. Thence he proceeded to Japan, but was prevented by death, in 1552, after ten years of successful mission-work, from proceeding, as he had intended, to preach in China.

The long-expected Council of Trent, the last of the series of Councils, was formally opened, after Mass in the Cathedral of the city, on December 13, 1545, in the Pontificate of Paul III., two months before the death of Luther, and whilst Henry VIII. was still on the throne of England; and continued its Sessions, which numbered in all twenty-five, for, with intermissions, eighteen years (1545—1563). They lasted during rather more than a year of Henry VIIIth's reign; during the whole of the reign of Edward; they witnessed the Counter-Reformation under Mary, and the repudiation of the Papacy again under Elizabeth. A short summary of its proceedings is all that our limits permit.

Session I. (December 13, 1545) and Session II. (January 7, 1546) were little more than of a formal character. But in the interval, various questions of procedure were discussed, as, for instance, whether the votes were to be taken by Nations or individuals. This point the Pope speedily settled, and ordered that they should be taken individually.

By the *Congregation*, or Committee, which sat after the Second Session, it was decided, by a compromise, that reforms of doctrine and discipline should be taken concurrently; but that this arrangement should not commence till Session V.

Session III. was of a similar character to the first two; the only decree promulgated being that the Creed of Constantinople should be accepted, and audibly recited by the Council. The real business did not commence till

Session IV. (April 8, 1546). The Lutherans had submitted their demands, that Tradition ought not to be put on a level with Scripture, and that the Canonical Scriptures are alone sufficient for salvation; that the Vulgate Translation of the Bible is full of errors, and that a new Translation should be made. Against their objections, the Apocrypha was accepted by the Council as canonical; Tradition was declared to be of equal authority with the Bible; and it was ruled that no one should interpret the Bible in a sense contrary to the Vulgate. The Council, however, virtually contradicted itself, and admitted the reasonableness of the Lutheran demands; for it proposed that the Pope should be petitioned to order a corrected Version to be published. Anathemas were pronounced against those who held contrary opinions.

In Session V. (June 17) it was decreed that the Virgin Mary is not included under the doctrine of Original Sin. Some salutary enactments were made as to the duties of Bishops and others having cure of souls; and that the *Regulars* should not, without licence from their Superiors, preach out of their own monasteries, nor in the Churches of the secular clergy, without permission of the Bishop of the Diocese.

In Session VI. (January 13, 1547) a decree was passed against the Lutheran doctrine of Justification, although a considerable minority, amongst whom was Pole, was willing to accept it with slight modification. Pole, being disappointed with the decree, absented himself from the further debates.

In Session VII. (March 3, 1547) the subject of discussion was the Sacraments. The number of Sacraments was declared to be seven, and several anathemas were passed against the teaching of the Protestants. These anathemas were so frequently pronounced, that henceforward, as they could affect no one, except the utterers of them, no reference need be made to them.

In Session VIII. (March 11), in consequence of a rumour that

a pestilence had broken out in Trent, the Pope directed that the Council should be transferred to Bologna, a city within the Papal dominions, where therefore it would be more subject to his control, and the refractory spirit against the Legates' power, which had manifested itself in the Council, be more easily curbed. The German Bishops, however, and the Bishop of Trent, refused to leave the city, without instructions from the Emperor. So,

Session IX. (April 21, 1547) and Session X. (June 2), which were held at Bologna and were purely formal, were attended by only six Archbishops and thirty-two Bishops. The Emperor refused to recognise the Bolognese Sessions, and on September 13, 1549, the Pope dissolved the Council.

In November of the same year Paul III. died, and was succeeded by Cardinal del Monte, the first President of the Council, who took the title of Julius III. The Council did not re-assemble for nearly two years.

Session XI. (May 1, 1551) was purely formal, and the Council was prorogued till September 1.

At Session XII. (September 1, 1551) so few German Bishops attended at Trent that it was decided to prorogue the Council. A protest was made on behalf of the King of France, that he could not send Bishops to the Council, because no adequate safe-conduct was assured them; and that, as he was thus excluded, the Council could not be considered a General one. In the subsequent Congregation, under pressure from the Emperor, and King of France, questions as to Communion in Both Kinds, and Clerical marriages, as well as certain passages on the Eucharist, extracted from the writings of Luther and Zwingli, were discussed.

In Session XIII. (October 11) Canons were passed asserting Transubstantiation, Eucharistic Adoration, and Reservation of the Sacrament.

Session XIV. (November 25) dealt with Penance and Extreme Unction. Fifteen canons were promulgated, concerning Penance,

which was said to consist of Contrition, Confession and Absolution, and four canons concerning Extreme Unction. Both were declared to be Sacraments instituted by Christ. Reformatory decrees were also passed on the jurisdiction of Bishops, the exemptions of privileged Corporations, appeals to the Pope, the rights of patronage, criminous Clerks, and Universities.

Session XV. (January 25, 1552) granted a safe conduct to the Protestants in less ambiguous language than before. The Session was cut short in consequence of the renewal of the war between Germany and France, little business being transacted.

At Session XVI. (April 28, 1554) the Council was by a Papal Bull suspended for two years; nor was any further Bull issued, during the Pontificate of Julius III., for its re-assembling. In July, Philip of Spain married Mary, Queen of England; and on November 30, Pole absolved England from excommunication.

The Pope dying in March, 1555, was succeeded by Cardinal Cervini, who took the title of Marcellus II. Great hopes which were entertained of a real reform under him were defeated by his death, three months after his election. Cardinal Caraffa succeeded under the title of Paul IV. (1555—1559). He had previously shown liberal tendencies and been an Oratorian; but after his election became a violent re-actionist; he introduced the Inquisition into Rome; would listen to no Council held outside Roman territory, and from which Protestants were not excluded; accordingly he took no steps towards the re-assembling of the Council of Trent.

On March 21, 1556, Archbishop Cranmer was burnt at Oxford, and on the following day Pole, a by no means *persona grata* to Paul on account of his liberal views and his having been put in opposition to him for the Papacy, was consecrated Archbishop. In 1558 Elizabeth became Queen of England.

On the death of the Pope on August 18, 1559, Giovanni Angelo de' Medici succeeded as Pius IV. (1559—1565), a man

of gentler character than his predecessor, and uncle of the famous St. Carlo Borromeo, whom he invited to Rome and created Cardinal-Archbishop of Milan, when only twenty-two years of age, and to whom he intrusted the chief ecclesiastical affairs. In November, 1560, he issued a Bull authorising the Council to re-assemble. But by this time, the Religious Peace of Augsburg had assured the position of the Protestants, and given them religious liberty. It was impossible therefore that they could acquiesce in the previous decrees of the Council which had anathematised them. Elizabeth of England also refused to allow the Nuncio, who had been sent to invite her to the Council, to cross the sea into England.

Whether this was a new Council, or only a continuation of the old, was a question of importance; for the Protestant Princes (and the Emperor agreed with them), demanded a perfectly new Council, untrammelled with the decisions of the old. The King of Spain objected, on the opposite ground, that the Bull had not stated with sufficient explicitness, that the new Sessions were only the continuance of the former Council. The first six Sessions assembled, XVII. (January 18, 1562); XVIII. (February 26); XIX. (May 14); XX. (June 4); XXI. (July 16); XXII. (September 17). One of the chief points insisted on, and ultimately, after angry debates and much opposition from the extreme papal party, passed, was the requirement that Bishops should reside in their Sees, the Pope himself, though granting licences of absence, being the chief transgressor. The Pope had now, as if the already overwhelming preponderance of Italian Bishops was not sufficient, in order to enforce his will and nullify opposition, sent a further relay of all the Bishops resident in Rome.

In Session XIX. the ambassadors of the Emperor proposed that the Popes themselves and the Roman Curia should be reformed; that excommunications should be more sparingly resorted to; fees for Sacraments abolished; yearly Synods held

by Bishops ; a reformation in the morals of the Clergy effected ; the Breviaries and Missals revived ; Church Services performed in the Vernacular language ; the Marriage of the Clergy and Communion in Both Kinds allowed.

In Session XXI. the office of *Questors*, or Sellers of Indulgences, was abolished. In the same Session it was determined that Whole Christ is received under One Kind ; that Communion under One or Two Kinds was to be regarded as a variable custom which it was within the power of the Church to determine.

In the congregation preparatory to Session XXII., the Pope ordered the Legates to concede to the German Emperor Communion in Both Kinds.

In Session XXII. it was decided, that the Roman Missal was pure and needed no revision ; that private Masses should be sanctioned ; and that water should be mixed with wine in the Eucharist.

Between Sessions XXII. and XXIII. was an interval of ten months all but two days ; and in the congregations violent disputes occurred between the Spaniards and Italians, the latter supporting the Ultramontane view of the Papal authority ; and blood was spilt in the streets of Trent. The subject before the Council was the Sacrament of Orders, in which the Jesuit, Lainez, the successor of Loyola, bore a prominent part, asserting that, though Bishops derived their commission from Christ, the sole source of Jurisdiction lay in the Pope.

On November 13, 1562, fourteen French Bishops, under the Cardinal of Lorraine, arrived. On November 23 he addressed the Council on the state of religion in France, advocating, in order to bring back the Huguenots to the Church, a wise conciliation and reform ; such as, amongst other matters, Communion in Both Kinds, Vernacular Services, and the Marriage of Priests. The question whether the jurisdiction of Bishops was from the Pope or immediately under God, still continued

a matter of dispute ; one Bishop asserting that as good Bishops existed without, as with, the Pope's confirmation, whilst an Irish Bishop stated that in England Bishops were called, elected, and consecrated by three Bishops, and given mission ; but there was one thing, and one only, against them, viz., that they had not been approved by the Roman Pontiff.

In March, 1563, the two principal Legates at the Council died, and business was postponed for a month, during which their successors were elected. Ferdinand, the German Emperor, complained that the business of the Council was entirely arranged at Rome, and that the Legates did nothing except by the Pope's order. In May, the Cardinal of Lorraine brought forward a schedule of reformation, in which he was supported by the Bishop of Granada. But so hopelessly at variance was the Council, that a proposal was made by the French ambassadors that the Council should be dissolved, and national reform effected by national Synods, a course to which the Pope himself seemed favourable, and which was the very course adopted in England. Another proposal was made, to declare Elizabeth a heretic and her Bishops no Bishops ; but this was prevented by the Spaniards, not from any love of the English Bishops, but from fear of retaliation.

The three concluding Sessions were held in 1563 ; Session XXIII. commencing on July 15 ; XXIV. on November 11 ; XXV. on December 3.

In Session XXIII. eight doctrinal Canons were passed, to the effect that the seven grades of the Roman Catholic ministry had existed from the earliest times ; and that Holy Orders are one of the Sacraments. Eighteen reformatory Canons were also passed, ordering, amongst other matters, the residence of Bishops and Clergy ; the erection of Theological Colleges in every Cathedral city, where candidates for the ministry should be trained, from twelve years of age.

In Session XXIV., which was of a very stormy character, the

indissolubility of marriages was affirmed, and twelve Canons were enacted, by one of which marriage of the Clergy was reprobated. Twenty-one articles also, for the reformation of the Clergy, were passed.

In the last Session (XXV. on December 3, 1563), hastily drafted decrees were passed, concerning Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints, the worshipping of Images and relics, Indulgences, the observance of Fasts and Festivals, and the prohibition of certain kinds of foods; whilst the superintendence of the Index of prohibited books, the composition of a Catechism, and the revision of the Breviary and Missal were to be remitted to the Pope. One decree in the last Session gave expression to what throughout had been the key-note of the Council, that whatever had been done in any Session of the Council was to be construed as without prejudice to the authority of the Pope. The Council was then dismissed.

Thus ended the Council of Trent. Its decrees were signed by two hundred and fifty-five Bishops, of whom one hundred and eighty-nine were Italians, and were, against the wish of the Curialists, ratified by the Pope on January 26, 1564. In case any difficulty should arise in the interpretation of its decrees, a special Committee, "The Congregation of the Council of Trent," was created. In the same year, A.D. 1564, "The Index of the Council of Trent" was published, a permanent board being established for putting condemned books on the Index. The Creed of Pope Pius IV. (*Professio Fidei Tridentinæ*) was also published. In 1566 was published by his successor, "The Catechism of the Council of Trent." The Creed and the Catechism were the declaration of the conclusions of the Council. A new edition of the Breviary was put forth in 1568, and of the Missal in 1570.

In 1590, the Roman Church virtually admitted that the Protestants had all along been right in their assertions that the Vulgate needed revision, for it put forth a new edition;

and when this version proved unsatisfactory, another edition was issued three years afterwards.

The Council, instead of recurring to antiquity, established twelve articles of faith not held by the early Church, and therefore not Catholic, but Roman Catholic; the greater number of them declared then for the first time, and pronounced to be necessary to Salvation. These articles were:—(1) The exact number of Seven Sacraments; (2) A doctrine of Justification by Faith, and of Original Sin, in the latter of which the Virgin Mary is not included; (3) Private Masses; (4) Transubstantiation; (5) Communion in One Kind; (6) Purgatory; (7) Invocation of Saints; (8) Veneration of relics; (9) Image Worship; (10) The Roman Church the Mother of all Churches; (11) Swearing obedience to the Popes; (12) The Faith of Trent necessary to salvation.

The decrees of the Council were received unreservedly by Italy, Portugal and Spain, and, as limited by the statutes of the kingdom, in the Spanish dominions. They were received by the Catholic Clergy in the hereditary dominions of the Emperor of Germany, only on condition of the Cup being conceded to the laity; but neither by the Imperial Diet, nor in Hungary, were they accepted.

In France, the doctrinal decrees only were accepted, whilst the disciplinary decrees were rejected, as opposed to the Liberties of the Gallican Church; and Cardinal Guise on his return from the Council to Paris, was severely blamed for truckling to the Pope, and was obliged to retire to Rheims.

The disciplinary decrees were far from being universally received in the Roman Church. As to its doctrinal decrees, the Council stultified itself, by signifying that such an important doctrine as that of Communion in One or Two Kinds may be, at one time right, at another wrong; and by allowing the Cup to the laity in the powerful German Empire, whilst it withheld it from other countries.

The object of reconciling Western Christendom was not effected, nor even attempted by the Council; whilst the differences between East and West were accentuated. The Council was not a General one, for in it, leaving out England, the whole of the Eastern Churches were unrepresented; its decrees therefore were only binding in those countries which voluntarily accepted them. The King of Denmark, in whose Kingdom Lutheranism was established, refused to have anything to do with a Papal Council; Elizabeth of England professed her willingness to be represented in a free Council, which, however, she contended the Council of Trent was not. The Roman Catholic Bishops of Germany had complained of the Pope being too much mixed up with the Council; whilst its composition was such that the Protestants of Germany regarded it, not as a deliberative assembly, but as a Tribunal before which they were to be put on their trial.

The Lutherans at first refused to attend a Papal Council, and one out of Germany, under any consideration. When, previous to the Fifth Session, the Imperial ambassador suggested that anathematising the Protestants was not a reasonable mode of reconciling them, he was quietly ignored by the Legates. Still, in a Diet at Augsburg, in September, 1547, this difficulty was got over, and the Lutheran Princes expressed their willingness to attend at Trent, on condition that the Council was free (that is, not presided over by Papal Legates); and a voice allowed to Protestant Divines.

But then again there was a further difficulty, in a supposed danger to Protestants attending at Trent. They had before them the case of Huss at Constance, and the breaking by that Council of the safeguard promised him by the Emperor; and they either failed to obtain a safe conduct at all, or when they did obtain a promise, it was couched in such obscure language as still to render their going there unsafe. And it was then too late. The Lutherans, who at first claimed to be loyal members

of the Roman Church, and in the Diet of Augsburg stated that all that they desired was the removal of abuses, had since then drifted further and further away. The Articles of Schmalcald denounced the Mass as a horrible prevarication, and the authority of the Pope as lying and blasphemous; and now, after having been freely anathematised by the Council, the Lutherans complained that the case had been already decided against them, and that the Pope, who ought to be the chief criminal, was to be their judge.

And so it would have been. The Pope ruled the Legates, and the Legates ruled the Council. The Committees and Subcommittees were controlled by the Legates, who received strict orders from the Pope as to their proceedings. Anything reflecting on the Roman Curia was to be first submitted to the Pope, and no debate whatever on the Pope's authority was to be allowed. Thus the principal object which Christendom had in view, the reforming the unholy lives of the Popes and the Roman Curia, was frustrated. No proposal could, except under strong opposition, originate with the Council; or, if it did, and the Legates disapproved of it, it was strangled in the birth. Nor was this restriction removed till towards the end of the Sessions, in 1563. The Pope listened to secret reports which were transmitted to him, and reproved the Legates, if he was led to believe that they acted in too liberal a spirit.

The immense preponderance of Curialists, who hated to be reformed, rendered any real Reformation impossible. The character of the Legates may be judged from those appointed by the Pope to the first Session. They were, the Cardinal del Monte, afterwards Pope Julius III., a thorough-going Curialist; Cardinal Cervini, afterwards Pope Marcellus II., a man already bound to the extirpation of heresy; and Cardinal Pole, who was so opposed to the one-sidedness of the Council, that he left it after the Sixth Session, and did not again take part in it.

The Registrar of the Council was Hugo Buoncompagno, the future Pope, Gregory XIII.

Though there was a great numerical preponderance of Italians opposed to any real reform, there was an influential minority of the members of the Council in favour of a conciliatory course; and no one reading the debates can be constrained from the conviction, that, notwithstanding the counter-pressure put on it by the Pope and the Curialists, if their wishes had been submitted to the Council, and the votes taken, as Pole suggested, by Nations instead of individuals, so as to counteract the numerical weight of Italians, the result would have been different. There is little doubt that (at any rate) Vernacular Services, Marriage of the Clergy, and Communion in Both Kinds, would have been conceded.

There was much in the Council which we must lament; but on the part of Rome it was an immense, and successful, piece of Church-craft. The unconciliatory and uncompromising attitude adopted throughout was in reality the salvation of the Roman Church. For, if once it had given way, it could never have held its own, in the face of the greater knowledge which had been brought to light, nor have resisted the tendencies of the times; and must have been swept away in the vortex of Liberalism.

By the Council, the Church of Rome drew a definite line between itself and the other Churches of Christendom, and acquired for itself a substantial agreement by a clearly defined, and systematic body, of doctrine and discipline. It reformed many of its glaring abuses, and gave itself a new life. It removed the scandals which had so long horrified Christendom, and put an end to the evil lives of the Popes, so that since then the Popes have been neither better nor worse than other Bishops. It improved its discipline, and stopped the sale of Indulgences which had called the Reformation under Luther and Zwingle into being. It learned to imitate in its schools and

seminaries the progress of the New Learning, which at one time threatened to be fatal to it; it paved the way for the band of Jesuits and other zealots, who enabled the Church of Rome—at a time when the zeal of Continental Protestantism had cooled down, and Lutherans and Calvinists were contending with each other for supremacy, to gain back a large part of Europe which it had lost.

But, we repeat, the Roman Reformation was not a Catholic Reformation; for it was not conducted on Catholic principles, and adopted several doctrines unknown to the Church of the Apostles, and in the earliest and purest ages. Romanists arrogate to themselves the exclusive name of Catholics; whilst some call the followers of the Church of Rome Papists. "Perhaps it is safest," says Professor Freeman, "to use the name *Roman Catholics*; a name which is not very consistent with itself, but avoids disputes either way; and which in England is the name known to the law."

Ireland from the first remained faithful to the Pope, and the introduction by Henry VIII. of the Reformation into the country was effected in opposition to the convictions of the large majority of the people. The King of England bore the title of *Lord* of Ireland, a title which was supposed to imply that he held the Kingdom under the Pope; and it was not till A.D. 1542 that he was declared, in an Act of Parliament, to be King of Ireland.

The Irish Church was, at the time, governed by four Archbishops, those of Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam, with twenty-six Suffragan Bishops. Cromer, Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of all Ireland, was a supporter of the Pope; but, A.D. 1536, George Brown, who had once been Provincial of the Augustine

Friars in England, was consecrated in England the first re-forming Archbishop of Dublin. In spite of the protest from the Irish Prelates, an Act was passed, in 1537, by the Irish Parliament, which declared Henry to be the Head of the Irish Church, and forbade appeals to Rome, and the payment of Peter-pence. A confiscation of the property of the Church, and of the Monasteries, which were said to number three hundred and seventy, with an annual income of £32,000, followed.

On the death, in 1543, of Archbishop Cromer, Dowdall was appointed to succeed him; he did not however answer the expectations of Henry; in 1551 he strongly opposed the introduction of the English Prayer-Book into the services of the Irish Church, which, however, was effected in that year by the Archbishop of Dublin. Dowdall was deposed in October, 1551, and in February, 1553, Goodacre, an Englishman, appointed in his place; Bale, a Protestant of extreme type, being consecrated to the See of Ossory. On the death of Goodacre, Dowdall was restored by Mary; Brown, Bale, and other Bishops, were deposed; in 1556 Romanism was restored by the Irish Parliament; Ireland was reconciled by a Papal Bull, the whole assembly of Lords and Commons listening on their knees, whilst a solemn *Te Deum* was sung in thankfulness of the event.

On the accession of Elizabeth, in the Parliament which met in January, 1560, statutes were passed under strong opposition reversing the Acts of Mary; the English Book of Common Prayer of 1549 was enforced; the reformed Faith became again the State Religion of Ireland, and the Irish people were compelled to attend the services of the established Church of England and Ireland. The Pope, regarding these proceedings as schismatical, appointed fresh Bishops to the Irish Sees; the Irish people conceived an invincible animosity against the English; the number of malcontents rapidly increased, and Ireland became a scene of war for thirty years.

Trinity College, Dublin, was founded A.D. 1591, and in its first year James Ussher, afterwards to become the learned, although somewhat tinged with Puritanism, Archbishop of Armagh, was admitted as one of its students.

C.—THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION.

CHANGE effected in England by the Wars of the Roses—The Tudors—Convocation, part of the Constitution—The principal changes under Henry VIII. effected by Convocation—Character of Henry—The English Reformation unlike the Continental—Cardinals Wolsey and Campeggio try the case of Henry's Divorce in England—Action of the Pope—Wolsey disgraced—The Reformation Parliament—The Clergy under Præmunire—The King marries Ann Boleyn—Cranmer, Archbishop—The King Supreme Head—Execution of Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher—Crumwell, Vice-gerent—Dissolution of the Monasteries—Tyndale's Bible Ten Articles—Coverdale's Bible—Gardiner's *De verâ Obedientiâ*—The *Bishops' Book*—Matthew's Bible—Deputation of foreign Protestants to England—The Great Bible—The Six Articles—The Erudition of a Christian Man—The Litany—Changes effected under Henry—Edward VI.—Influx of foreign Protestants into England—The King's Guardians—First Book of Homilies—Communion in Both Kinds decreed—The First Prayer-Book of King Edward VI.—The Second Prayer-Book—Forty-two Articles—The Church Catechism—Mary, Queen—The Reformation under Edward VI. reversed—Mary marries Philip of Spain—England reconciled to Rome by Pole—Martyrdom of Rogers, Bishops Hooper, Farrar, Ridley, Latimer, and Archbishop Cranmer—Pole, Archbishop—Death of the Queen and Pole—Elizabeth, Queen—The action of Paul IV.—The Prayer-Book of Elizabeth's reign—Bishops deprived—Parker consecrated Archbishop—Pope Pius IV. and the Prayer-Book—The Thirty-nine Articles—The English Reformation completed—The Bull *Regnans in Excelsis*—Jesuit Seminaries at Douay, Rheims, and Rome—Seminarists sent into England—Their objects to assassinate the Queen, and re-establish the Papacy—Severe laws against the Romanists—The Spanish Armada—The Puritan Schism—Archbishop Grindal—Archbishop Whitgift—Prevalence of Puritanism—The object of the English Reformation, to restore the Church of the Apostles and early times.

THE New Learning had found influential advocates in England; the Wars of the Roses were ended; the Tudor dynasty was settled on the throne. The Middle Ages, says Mr. Brewer, came to an end in England with the death of Henry VII. A new England had sprung into life. The old Nobility had been almost annihilated in the Wars of the Roses. A new nobility, selected from a lower stratum of society, from those

who had done good service in the late wars, had arisen. And this new nobility, so far from wishing, like their predecessors, to limit the authority of the Crown, saw in its extension an increase of their own greatness. The Royal Supremacy was no longer a tradition or a theory, but a fact.

The position of England in the world was very different then to what it is now. It had little weight in the Councils of Europe; a mere second or third-rate power; "a wealthy parvenu," it has been called, "in the family of nations." Tudor pride was little calculated to endure this; and to bring England to something like the proud position which it now occupies in the world, was the ambition of Henry VIII.

The same spirit which led Henry to aspire to foreign ascendancy, was little calculated to lead him to endure an unconstitutional authority in his own kingdom. The time, long delayed but never forgotten, had come, when the usurped powers of the Pope were no longer possible; when the Royal Supremacy, which had all along been guarded by Statutes of Provisors and Præmunire, must be again asserted, and the Supremacy of the Pope for ever abolished by the united voice of King, Convocation, and Parliament.

Henry was a favourer of the New Learning; in theory, at any rate, he was a staunch Churchman, and lived and died a Roman Catholic. Convocation was, equally with Parliament, part of the Constitution of the Realm, and was the guide in spiritual matters, as Parliament was in the civil administration of the country. To be a Constitutional Monarch, and to employ Convocation in its rightful sphere, was the King's aim. He would never have allowed Parliament to proceed without the sanction of Convocation. Parliament only registered the Acts of Convocation; or (to quote the much lamented Mr. Aubrey Moore), Parliament registered the vote of the Sovereign; and the fancied independence of the Reformation Parliament is a fiction of historians.

The Divorce of Henry VIII. was a mere accident in the Reformation, and what Logicians call, a very *separable accident*; for if it had never occurred, the English Reformation would have taken place all the same, and at the same time. With the character of Henry, the Reformation has nothing to do; the abolition of the Papal Supremacy, and all the principal changes affecting the Church were effected at the instance of Convocation; we cannot enter into the motives of Henry (those God alone could penetrate), but the patent fact remains that the English Reformation was Ecclesiastical, not Parliamentary.

Henry was in many respects the man best fitted for the political occasion. Nature, it was said, had done everything for him, intellectually and physically; we wish we could add also, morally. In person, in accomplishments, in sports, he stood pre-eminent; his face, his dress, his skill at tennis, nay, his very beard (a novelty in England which he imitated from Francis I. of France, a Monarch scarcely less handsome than himself), were described by the Chroniclers of the time with admiration. We do not admire Henry VIII.; he was a tyrant and in many respects objectionable; but he was looked upon by the Nation as ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν, and he carried the English with him.

The history of the English Reformation is so well known that few only of the more salient points need be mentioned.

In 1509, Henry VIII., at the age of eighteen, succeeded his father on the throne of England. In the lifetime of his brother Arthur, he had been educated, as a younger son, with a view to his holding some high position in the Church; but the death of his brother made him heir to the throne. On June 3, 1509, he, under a Bull of dispensation from Julius II., which, as it was in clear contravention of the Bible, the Pope had no power to grant, married Katharine of Aragon, the widow of his brother who had died a mere boy. The marriage of Henry with Katharine involved the question, Can the Pope override the

Law of God? The Church of Rome said he could, the Church of England said that he could not. After being married to her for eighteen years, and having only one surviving child, the future Queen Mary, he professed a remorse of conscience, and requested Pope Clement VII. to dissolve the marriage.

The Pope was in a difficulty; he wished to oblige Henry, but he did not wish to offend the Emperor, Charles V., who was Katharine's nephew. In 1528 he appointed Cardinal Wolsey, who, by the King's own request, had been appointed Cardinal Legate, together with Cardinal Campeggio, to try the case in England. The Court sat from June 18—July 30, 1529, when the Pope dissolved it; and, listening to an appeal of Katharine, summoned the King and Queen to appear before him in Rome, in 1532. This was a strong measure for a Pope to take, and a greater degradation than had been put on the Kingdom since the days of John, and it was more than any King, much less a Tudor, who had any respect for his dignity, was likely to tolerate.

A general disgust (especially amongst the Clergy), in which Wolsey shared, prevailed in England, at the idea of the King's marrying Ann Boleyn; and she, in revenge, brought about Wolsey's ruin. The old law of *Præmunire* was put in motion against him; by accepting (although it was at the King's own request) from the Pope the office of Legate, he was subjected to heavy penalties; he was deprived of nearly all the offices which he held; and, on November 30, 1530, died broken-hearted in Leicester Abbey. Sir Thomas More had before succeeded him as Chancellor of England in 1529.

On November 3, 1529, the Retormation Parliament met, and continued its Sessions for some years.

In 1530 the introduction of Papal Bulls into England was forbidden by a Royal proclamation.

The Clergy being opposed to the King's projected marriage with Ann Boleyn, were, together with the laity, placed under

Præmunire for having recognised Wolsey's Legatine authority. The laity were soon pardoned. The Southern Convocation met on January 21, 1531, and agreed to compound with the King by the payment of £100,044, the Northern Convocation afterwards agreeing to pay £18,840. The King also demanded that they should acknowledge him as the only protector and supreme Head of the Church ("*Ecclesie et Cleri Anglicani cujus protector et supremum caput is est*"). This, however, the Convocation boldly withstood; and eventually only agreed to the King's Supremacy with the limitation "as far as the Law of Christ allows" (*quantum per Christi Legem licet*).

In the same year Convocation petitioned against the payment of Annates, and that, if necessary, England should withdraw its allegiance from the Pope. In the next year, pursuant to the petition of Convocation, an Annates Act of Parliament was passed against the payment. Cranmer was in the same year appointed to succeed Warham as Archbishop of Canterbury.

In January, 1533, the King married Ann Boleyn. On May 23, Cranmer annulled the marriage with Katharine, and on May 28, confirmed the King's marriage with Ann. In March, 1534, the Pope declared by a Bull the marriage with Katharine to have been lawful, and threatened to excommunicate the King. Thus the rupture between the King and Rome was complete.

In the Parliament which met in January, 1534, an Act was passed for the *Restraint of Appeals* to Rome, under penalties of *Præmunire*.

On March 31, the Convocation of Canterbury, and, on May 5, that of York, agreed that "The Pope has no greater jurisdiction conferred on him by God in Holy Scripture, in the Kingdom of England, than any other foreign Bishop." Thus the Papal Supremacy was abolished by the Church of England before it was abolished by Parliament.

Another Annates Act confirming the former was passed in

this year. It also enacted that no person should thenceforth be presented by the Pope to any Archbishopric or Bishopric within the Realm. It was also declared by another Statute that the King had no intention "to vary from the Catholic faith of Christendom, or in anything declared in Holy Scripture and the Word of God to be necessary to Salvation."

In November the Act of Supremacy was passed, declaring that the King should be reputed "the only Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England called *Anglicana Ecclesia*."

In 1535, Sir Thomas More, and Cardinal Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, the latter fourscore years of age, were executed.

The King, as Supreme Head, appointed Cromwell his Vicegerent, with, amongst other duties, the power to hold a general Visitation of the Monasteries, which accordingly commenced in October.

The monks were the friends of the Pope and the opponents of the King's Supremacy, and had few friends. Their condemnation was a foregone conclusion. In 1536, three hundred and seventy-six of the smaller Monasteries were dissolved, and their revenues and property given to the King. This produced a deep feeling throughout the country, and led to serious rebellions, which were mercilessly suppressed.

In the larger Monasteries the commissioners had reported that "religion was well kept and preserved." Nevertheless, in the summer of 1537, their visitation commenced. In 1538, Pope Paul III. issued a Bull of Excommunication and deprivation against the King.

The visitation of the Monasteries continued all through the year 1538, and in the spring of the next year a Second Act of Suppression was passed; the larger Monasteries went the same way as the former, and their property was confiscated. Twelve of the Mitred Abbots were executed; and, in all, about one hundred thousand monks, a large proportion of the whole population, which then numbered only about three millions,

were thrown on the world. Henry had declared his intention of devoting the property of the Monasteries to Church purposes. Six new Sees, very inadequately endowed, were founded from their revenues: those of Oxford, Gloucester, Bristol, Peterborough, Chester, and Westminster, the last soon to be annexed to the See of London.

Previously to the dissolution of the Monasteries, the Spiritual Peers had greatly outnumbered the Temporal Peers in the House of Lords; when there were no longer Abbots and Priors, the influence of the Church in Parliament visibly diminished.

In 1534 Convocation had petitioned for an authorised Translation of the Bible. In 1526 William Tyndale, a native of Gloucestershire, had published at Worms an English Translation of the New Testament, rendered from the original Greek. Tyndale, together with Miles Coverdale, also prepared a Translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew; but the work was considered unsatisfactory, and was cut short in 1536, for in that year he suffered death by burning at Villefort, near Brussels.

Three doctrinal Formularies of Faith were published in the reign of Henry; *The Ten Articles*; *The Institution of a Christian Man*; and *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*. In the first Session of the new Parliament of 1536 Ten Articles were passed, the five first on matters necessary for salvation. These were:—(1) The Bible, the Three Creeds, and First Four General Councils; (2) Regeneration in Baptism; (3) The Sacrament of Penance; (4) The Sacrament of the Altar; (5) Justification. Customs, not necessary to salvation, but yet retained, were:—(6) Images; (7) Honour due to Saints; (8) Prayer to the Saints; (9) Certain rites and ceremonies; (10) Purgatory.

In the Ten Articles three Sacraments only are mentioned. In Convocation, in July, the number of the Sacraments was debated; it was pointed out that the question turned on the meaning of the word *Sacrament*, which was applied to seven rites; but no decision was arrived at. Our XXVth Article limits

the number of those *ordained by Christ* and *generally necessary to Salvation*, to Baptism, and the Holy Eucharist.

In October, Coverdale's Bible, partly translated out of *Douche* and *Latin*, and partly a reproduction of Tyndale's, appeared from a foreign press.

In the same year, an important Treatise, as showing the opinions of such men as Gardiner and Bonner on the Pope's Supremacy, was published. In his *De Verâ Obedientiâ*, which appeared in that year (to a second edition of which Bonner wrote the Preface), Gardiner says; St. Peter in the Scriptures held no Primacy over the other Apostles—in *Scripturis de Primatu Petri nulla facta est mentio*—nor is there "a single word for the Bishop of Rome's Primacy in the Bible." • Precedence amongst the Apostles, he says, belonged to St. James, Bishop of Jerusalem. No Kings of England had owned the Pope's Supremacy as *de jure divino*. The title of Henry VIII. of Supreme Head, though new, is only the expression of the Supremacy always held by the King.

In May, 1537, appeared the second of the Formularies, *The Institution of a Christian Man*, commonly known as the *Bishops' Book*, and intended to be a compromise between the men of the Old and those of the New Learning. It contained an exposition of the Apostles' Creed; of Seven Sacraments (in the Ten Articles only Three were mentioned), of which the Eucharist, Baptism, and Penance are the most necessary; of the Ten Commandments; the Pater Noster; the Ave Maria; and two articles on Justification and Purgatory. The Institution, however, had not the authority of Convocation nor of Parliament, and was put forth, *provisionally*, by the King, and declared to be a temporary measure.

In this year was published Matthew's Bible—a fictitious title, of which the probable author was John Rogers, the first Martyr in Queen Mary's reign. It was a compound of Tyndale's and Coverdale's Bibles.

In 1538, a deputation from the Protestant Princes of Germany arrived in England, to advocate a union of the English Church with the Lutherans. Henry had before invited Melanchthon to England, in order to consult with him; Melanchthon was prevented from coming; and such a union as the Lutherans now proposed the King rejected.

In 1539, Cranmer's, or the Great, Bible was published.

The Six Articles Act, or Whip with Six Cords, was a reactionary Act; it was entitled "an Act for abolishing of diversity of opinions in certain articles concerning Christian Religion." It was brought forward by a layman, the Duke of Norfolk, the great Papal Champion, and forced on Parliament by the King, to whom all the Bishops, except Shaxton, gave way. But it was not the voluntary act of the Church; it was, however, sanctioned both by Parliament and Convocation, and decreed with severe penalties; but there is reason to believe it was almost entirely inoperative. It enacted (1) Transubstantiation; (2) Communion in One Kind; (3) Celibacy of the Clergy; (4) The Binding character of Vows of Chastity; (5) Private Masses; (6) The necessity of Auricular Confession to a Priest.

In 1542, the first step in the way of Liturgical revision, and of reading the Bible in Church in the vernacular language, was taken by Convocation. Cranmer moved, on February 12, that the Mass-Books, Antiphoners, and Portuises, should be examined; the name of the Pope, and Thomas Becket, expunged, and various apocryphas, legends, and saints, not mentioned in Scripture or the Fathers, removed. It is not known how far the work advanced. A new edition of the Sarum Breviary was at the same time issued.

In 1543, the Church was ordered by Convocation to read on Festivals, *from the Great Bible*, one Chapter out of the Old Testament after the *Te Deum*, and one from the New Testament after the *Magnificat*.

In the same year appeared *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition*

of a *Christian Man*, which was a reactionary revision of the *Institution*, and asserted more strongly the Royal Supremacy, Transubstantiation, Communion in One Kind, Fasting, and Celibacy of the Clergy; but it received the authority of Convocation.

The next step taken, in 1544, by Convocation was, to compile from various old Litanies one common Litany to be used in Church; this Litany, certain prayers to Saints and Angels, and the clause "from the tyranny of Rome and all its detestable enormities" being omitted, is almost identical with our present Litany.

The *Primer* of Henry VIII., set forth in 1545, and approved by Convocation, included the Lord's Prayer, Ave Maria, Apostles' Creed, Ten Commandments, prayers for Matins and Evensong and Compline, the Litany, and some admirable prayers for private use.

It will be seen that under Henry, the Church underwent little doctrinal change; and the Act of Six Articles and the *Erudition* were a distinct triumph of the Old over the New Learning. The Papal Supremacy was abolished; the Bible translated; various superstitious usages swept away; and the public services of the Church revised. All these changes were effected at the instance, or by the sanction of Convocation. To get rid of the constitutional abuse of the Pope's Supremacy, and to establish that of the King, was Henry's chief aim. He wrote to Cardinal Pole, that it was not his intention "to separate himself or his Realm from the unity of Christ's Church, but inviolably at all times to keep and observe the same, and to redeem the Church of England out of captivity of foreign powers heretofore usurped therein."

Henry died January 28, 1547. He burnt with an impartial hand, Catholics and Protestants alike; and at his death the question remained to be solved—What direction the English Reformation would take; whether it would be Roman Catholic,

or Protestant, or Catholic? He was succeeded by his son Edward VI., a precocious boy nine years of age, and under him the doctrinal Reformation commenced, and took a decidedly Protestant direction.

The young King was much guided by Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Cranmer was not the most reliable guide he could have had. Cranmer was not a learned man, nor a consistent Churchman; but timid and vacillating, carried about by every blast of doctrine; now leaning to Romanism, now Lutheranism, now Erastianism, which the changing spirit of the times brought in vogue. He himself took, as his second wife, the daughter of Osiander, a follower of Luther. At Cranmer's invitation there came to England, amongst others, Peter Martyr, who had been a monk at Fiesole, but had married a nun; and Bucer, and Fagius. Bucer and Fagius became Theological lecturers at Cambridge, and Martyr, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. Hooper had, under fear of the Six Articles, fled into Switzerland, where he made the acquaintance of Bullinger and Calvin, and became thoroughly imbued with Calvinism. Returning to England, he was in 1551 consecrated Bishop of Gloucester, and was desirous of reducing the Church of England to the level of Calvinistic bareness and simplicity.

Two worse guardians than the Protectors, the Duke of Somerset and the Duke of Northumberland, the King could not have had. The former, in his zeal for Protestantism, was guilty of indiscriminate sacrilege; in 1549 he caused his own brother, Lord Thomas Seymour, to be executed; and in 1552 he himself was beheaded on Tower Hill on a charge of felony.

Still worse was the Duke of Northumberland; a man thoroughly devoid of Christian principle, whose great object was to secure the Crown for his own family, and, in the interest of his daughter-in-law, Lady Jane Grey, to advocate Protestantism. Yet when brought to the scaffold, he died a Papist, and confessed that he

had all along been a hypocrite ; that he had only promoted the Reformation from his own interest, and had been all the time a Papist.

People are always to be found who are never contented, but are desirous of change, merely for the sake of change. So now a small but noisy body of agitators wished to thoroughly revolutionise the Church. Certain undoubted improvements were made during the reign of Edward. In the first year of his reign the First Book of Homilies was published, but not with the sanction of Convocation. At the request of Convocation the penal Statutes *de Hæretico Comburendo* and the *Six Articles* were abrogated. Communion in Both Kinds was decreed, first by a Canon of Convocation, and then by Act of Parliament ; it was pronounced to be more agreeable to the practice of the Apostles, and the Primitive Church, for more than the first five Centuries. In 1548 Cranmer's Catechism (not to be confounded with the Church Catechism) was published, with an exposition of the Ten Commandments following the Roman arrangement ; and of three Sacraments, Baptism, the Eucharist, and Penance.

The Canon of Convocation, as to the reception of the Holy Communion in Both Kinds, rendered necessary a change in the Missal. The Missal and Breviary having been revised, in 1549, in the second year of the reign, the First Prayer-Book of King Edward VI. appeared, sanctioned by Convocation, and ordered by Parliament. In the same year, at the instance of Convocation, the marriage of the clergy was grudgingly, and under strong opposition, passed by Parliament. These were improvements in a Catholic direction. But, as a set-off against these advantages, such Chantries as had escaped spoliation in Henry's reign were destroyed, and their revenues confiscated, only a small sum being allotted to the endowment of twenty-two Grammar Schools, known under the name of King Edward VIth's Schools.

But under the influence of the Zwinglo-Calvinism which was

gaining ground, complaints were heard that the Prayer-Book, which was favourably received by moderate men of both the Old and New Learning, was nothing but the Mass and Breviary in English. A second Prayer-Book, more favourable to their views, was published in 1552, and ordered by Parliament to come in use on All Saints' Day (November 1). But there is no proof that it ever received the sanction of Convocation, and it appears to have been imposed by State-authority; it was received with general disfavour by Clergy and Laity alike, and there is no evidence to show that it ever came into use.

In 1553 *Forty-two Articles of Religion* (from which the Thirty-nine Articles of 1563 were derived) were, in pursuance of an Order in Council, drawn up by Cranmer, who took the Lutheran documents, and especially the Augsburg Confession, as his model. There is no proof that (although it is probable they did) they received the sanction of Convocation.

In 1553 the first part of the Church Catechism, written probably by Bishop Poynt of Winchester, was published with the sanction of Convocation.

Edward VI., whose health had been from the first precarious, died July 6, 1553. Under the Protector Northumberland, Edward wishing for the continuation of Protestantism, excluded both his sisters, Mary and Elizabeth, from the succession. The next in right after them was the Lady Jane Grey, daughter-in-law of the Protector, and a Protestant. But Protestantism had not taken deep root in England, and could easily be overthrown; the Duke of Northumberland was unpopular; and though Jane was at first, on July 10, proclaimed Queen, Mary, a Roman Catholic, a Spaniard on her mother's side, and in her feelings more Spanish than English, had an easy victory, and on July 20, with the utmost demonstration of joy of the people, became Queen.

Mary declared shortly after her accession that the Protestants should be unmolested. She was not of a naturally cruel temper,

and probably meant what she said. Yet on September 13, Latimer was consigned to the Tower as *a seditious preacher*; Northumberland was sent to the scaffold; and Lady Jane Grey imprisoned.

An Act of Parliament in the first year of her reign repealed the Acts of Uniformity of the previous reign. The marriage of the Clergy, Communion in Both Kinds, and other laws respecting Religion, passed under Edward VI., were repealed, and the services of the Church restored as they were in the last year of Henry VIII.

In February, 1554, Lady Jane Grey with her husband and the Duke of Suffolk were beheaded, and Elizabeth, Mary's half-sister, imprisoned.

It was desired in England that the Queen should marry an Englishman; but she was averse to an English marriage; the idea of the Spanish Inquisition was hateful in England; yet on July 25, 1554, she married Philip, Prince of Spain, who had just lost his wife, and was eleven years younger than herself. The Queen had hitherto been guided by the moderate counsels of Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester; henceforward the government of the country was practically in the hands of Philip, the embodiment of bigotry and cruelty; and it was resolved to subject England again to the Pope.

On November 24, Reginald Pole, the grandson of the Duke of Clarence, who was drowned in a butt of Malmsey, his mother being the unfortunate Countess of Salisbury who was brought to the scaffold, was after a long exile sent into England by Pope Julius III. The Nobles and great men in the kingdom, who were at first fearful that they would be deprived of the Abbey and chantry lands which had been granted them, being satisfied with the assurance of Pole, that the Pope would confirm them in their possessions, were ready to abjure the Reformation; and on St. Andrew's Day (November 30) Pole absolved England, and restored "the prodigal son" to "the unity of our mother, the

Holy Church." Thus the Papal Supremacy was once more established in England.

Several Bishops and many others suffered in the calamities which followed. On February 4, 1555, Rogers, a Prebendary of St. Paul's, the supposed author of Matthew's Bible, was burnt at Smithfield; on February 9, Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, was burnt in his cathedral city; on March 30, Farrar, Bishop of St. David's, at Carmarthen. On October 16, Bishops Ridley and Latimer, and, on March 21 of the following year, Archbishop Cranmer, were burnt at Oxford. On the day after Cranmer's death, Pole, who was unwilling to supplant him in his lifetime, was consecrated to succeed him. Pole had shown himself in Rome a favourer of a moderate Reformation on Lutheran principles, and was in consequence an object of dislike to Pope Paul IV., who summoned him to appear at Rome on a charge of heresy. The Queen, however, who was neither an admirer of the Pope, nor admired by him, and who had a will as strong as that of her father, refused to let him go. He only enjoyed his latest honour for a short time, dying on November 18, 1558, the Queen, under an accumulation of disasters, neglected by her husband, an object of dislike to all, suspicious even of Pole himself, dying a few hours before him.

To the marriage of Mary with Philip, and her consequent alliance with Spain in its war with France, England owed its loss of Calais, in January, 1558. Great discontent in consequence prevailed in England. With Spain and Roman Catholicism the people associated their calamities, whilst the prosperity of the land seemed to be connected with Protestantism. Such was the feeling of the country when Elizabeth ascended the throne of England.

Elizabeth had acted with prudence, or Mary would probably have sent her to the scaffold as she had sent Lady Jane Grey; and her bigoted husband would doubtless have been glad thus to secure the throne to the Roman Catholic, Mary Stuart.

Elizabeth was opposed to Lutheranism and Calvinism. She would have liked the Reformation to be restored as it had been under her father, with, no doubt, the services in English and the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI.; but in any case without the Supremacy of the Pope. At the very commencement of her reign, the Protestant party in England was re-inforced by the return of the exiles who, during the persecution in Mary's reign, had taken refuge in Strasburg, Frankfort, Basle, Zurich, and Geneva. She endeavoured the impossible task of reconciling these heterogeneous elements to the Church; and the Bishops she appointed were generally selected from this class. By a proclamation, issued December 28, 1558, liberty was given to read in Church the Epistles and Gospels; as well as the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Litany in the vulgar tongue. The rest of the service was to be according to the rubrics of the Missal and Breviary. At her Coronation on January 15, 1559, the Mass was celebrated, but without the elevation of the Host.

The future of the Church of England depended in a great measure on the Pope's action. The conduct of Paul IV. was coarse and offensive; he refused to acknowledge her on the ground that she was illegitimate, and because her accession to the throne, which he said was a fief of the Holy See, without his sanction, was an act of impertinence. The Queen took no notice of his conduct beyond withdrawing her ambassador from Rome.

Elizabeth refused the title of Supreme Head, but accepted that of Supreme Governor, of the Church.

On April 29 was passed "An Act for restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the State, ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolishing all foreign powers repugnant to the same." The same Act provided that no matter should be considered heresy, except what has been defined to be such by the Canonical Scriptures, or the First Four General Councils, or any other General Council; or shall be adjudged heresy "by the High

Court of Parliament in the Realm with the assent of the Clergy in their Convocation." The Supremacy Act also repealed the Acts passed in the reign of Mary, and restored and revised those of Edward VI.

It was the wish of Cecil and the Queen to restore the Prayer-Book of 1549 ; this, however, under opposition from the returned exiles, was impracticable ; a compromise was therefore effected, the Prayer-Book of 1552 being taken as the basis for a new Prayer-Book. With this the Puritan party were satisfied ; some alterations, however, of the greatest importance were made, which rendered the new Prayer-Book nearly as Catholic as that of 1549. The ornaments of the Church and the vestments of the minister, which had been prescribed by the First, but omitted in the Second Book, were restored by the Ornaments Rubric. In the Litany, the clause "From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome . . . Good Lord, deliver us," was omitted. The reinsertion into the Communion Office of the first clause in the administration of the Bread and Wine, which had been omitted in the Second, brought back the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence. The Rubric also, known as the Black Rubric, as to kneeling in the Eucharist, was omitted.

All the Diocesan Bishops, except Kitchen of Landaff, refusing to accept the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, were deprived. In December, 1559, Matthew Parker, a learned man and a thorough Catholic, who had remained in England during the Marian troubles, and was untainted with Zwinglian or Calvinistic teaching, was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth, by Barlow, late Bishop of Bath and Wells, Scory, late Bishop of Chichester, Coverdale, late Bishop of Exeter, and Hodgkins, Suffragan Bishop of Bedford. The Nag's Head Fable, which was on a par with the Pseudo-Clementines and the Forged Decretals, and is now universally disbelieved by all Roman Catholics, whose opinion is worth having, need only be mentioned to be dismissed. In the words of the late Dr. Döllinger,

perhaps, with Cardinal Newman, the most learned Roman Catholic of his day:—"The fact that Parker was consecrated by four rightly-consecrated Bishops (*rité et légitimé*), with imposition of hands, is so clearly established, that if one chooses to doubt the fact, one could with the same right doubt one hundred thousand facts."

On August 18, 1560, Pope Paul IV. died. The Catholic character of the English Prayer-Book; the omission from the Litany of the petition against the Pope; the use of the proper Ecclesiastical Vestments in the Eucharist; the employment of cheerful music in the Services; created in the minds of the Roman Catholics a different impression from what they had formed from the gloomy and uncatholic Protestantism of Geneva; and Anglicans and Romanists alike embraced the English Reformation. The Church had again become a truly Catholic, and a truly National Church.

The New Pope, Pius IV., a gentler man than his predecessor, clearly understood this; and he saw that a new policy must be adopted towards England; he sent his nuncio hither with his Apostolical benediction to the Queen; together with a letter addressed "*Carissimæ in Christo, filiæ Elizabethæ, reginæ Angliæ (to my dearest daughter in Christ, Elizabeth, Queen of England)*"; and, we have it on high authority, announcing his readiness to authorise the English Prayer-Book, if only the Queen would receive it from him, and give her adhesion to the See of Rome. But, insulted as Elizabeth had been by his predecessor, she refused to admit the Nuncio into England. Still it is evident that the Pope considered the Prayer-Book to be Catholic, or he would not have expressed his willingness to authorise it. The Pope also invited her to send representatives to the Council of Trent; she refused, on the same ground as the German Princes, that it was not a free Council.

In 1563, both Convocations subscribed the XXXIX Articles,

which were framed out of the Forty-two Articles^a. The groundwork of those Articles was, as before stated, the Augsburg Confession; everything, however, in that Confession, which savoured of Lutheranism and was not Catholic, being omitted. Four of the Forty-two being omitted, and Four added, viz., V., of the Holy Ghost; XII., Of Good Works; XXIX., Of the wicked which eat not, &c.; XXX., Of Both Kinds;—Forty-two Articles were presented on January 19 to Convocation. Ultimately the Articles took the number of XXXIX., and were approved by Convocation on January 31, the commencing words of Article XX., “The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies,” being inserted, it is supposed, at the suggestion of the Queen herself.

In the same year appeared also the Second Book of Homilies.

The English Reformation under Elizabeth may now be said to have been completed. The Roman Catholic Reformation was completed a few months afterwards, when in December, 1563, the Council of Trent terminated its Sessions.

The Romanists were settling down quietly in the country, and frequenting the Services of the Church of England, when Pope Pius V., in 1570, issued the Bull *Regnans in Excelsis*, by which he excommunicated the *pretended Queen of England* as a *vassal of iniquity*, and took upon himself to absolve the English Nation from their allegiance, and to subject those who adhered to her to excommunication. It is a logical conclusion that he did not excommunicate the Queen, because the Church of England was uncatholic, for Pius IV. had virtually pronounced the Prayer-Book to be Catholic; and the Book of Common Prayer is to the Church of England what the Missal and Breviary are to the Church of Rome. As the Roman Catholics maintain that the Popes, speaking *ex cathedrâ*, are infallible, one Pope cannot pronounce a document to be uncatholic, which another Pope has just before pronounced to be Catholic. He must therefore

^a See p. 635.

have issued his Bull on another ground, and that ground could only have been the refusal of England to recognise the Supremacy of the Pope.

From the issuing of that Bull dates the commencement of the Papal schism in England. Mary, Queen of Scots, was at the time a prisoner in the country. The schism was fermented by conspiracies formed for her liberation, and for the assassination of Elizabeth; with the view of revolutionising the government, securing the throne to a Roman Catholic, and restoring the Roman Faith. In fairness to English Romanists, it is only just to say that, although severe laws were passed against them under Elizabeth, and hearing or saying Mass had been subjected to heavy fines, and notwithstanding much other cruel treatment which they had received, they now, as well as before the Bull was issued, remained faithful to their Queen and Country.

As early as A.D. 1568, a Seminary of Jesuits had been founded at Douay, from funds supplied by Philip II. of Spain, for the training of English missionaries, with the view of their returning to England and reclaiming it to the Roman Catholic Faith; and it was placed under the direction of William Allen, a Fellow of Oriel. In 1578, the Seminary was transferred to Rheims. In the latter year also was founded the College of the *Seminarists* at Rome, of which Persons, a former Fellow of Balliol, was appointed Rector. On June 25, 1580, the first Mission of Jesuit *Seminarists* was, with the blessing of Pope Gregory XIII., despatched to England under Persons and Campion, the latter a former Fellow of St. John's, Oxford. Several of the number, when apprehended, did not hesitate to admit that their object was to assassinate the Queen, and re-establish Popery. The massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572, was still fresh in the memory of Englishmen. The Government was seriously alarmed, and severe laws were passed against the Roman Catholics. Persons effected his escape from England, but Campion was,

in 1581, executed at Tyburn, professing (it is only proper to state) his innocence.

In 1587, Mary, Queen of Scots, was beheaded for a supposed complicity in a plot against Elizabeth's life. The conspiracies against Elizabeth's life had so enflamed the nation, that it is doubtful whether the Queen could, if she would, have refused to sign the warrant of execution. But the indignation of the Roman conspirators was intensified. Allen, who had, at the request of Philip, been created a Cardinal, finding that his seminary Priests met with no success in re-converting England, now turned into an open traitor, and allured Philip on to the conquest of England; in case of success, Philip was to become King, and Allen, Archbishop of Canterbury. The Spanish Armada, which set out for that purpose from Lisbon, on May 30, 1588, was shattered to pieces by storms; and its destruction sealed the fate of Rome, and of Philip, the champion of reactionism, and crowned the victory of the English Reformation.

At the same time as the Papal Schism, commenced the Puritan separation from the Church of England. The followers in England of Calvin and Zwingle, who were opponents of the Vestments and of the Catholic character of the Prayer-Book Services, were called Puritans, a name corresponding with the Catharists (*καθαροί*, pure) of the early Church. Puritanism, which had hitherto been a school of thought within the Church, began, A.D. 1573, to fall away from it, and by degrees the Puritans formed themselves into separate communities, and built Conventicles. The character of the Popes, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, had rendered the very name of Rome, and everything connected with it, thoroughly hateful to a section of Englishmen. They rejected not only what was bad, but whatever was Catholic, in the Church of Rome; and with Rome they connected the Catholic Services and ritual of the Church of England. The foreign Protestants had no Bishops, the highest Order being that of Presbyters,

or Elders, who conferred Orders; and, like the Calvinists, the Puritans objected to the English Prayer-Book and wished to do away with Bishops.

The gentle character of Archbishop Parker, at a time when the Church was in danger between the Scylla and Charybdis of Romanism and Puritanism, through fear of the former yielded too much to the latter; but on the whole he held the scales evenly between them, and it is to his credit that he died hated by the one as much as by the other. Grindal (1576—1583), his successor in the Primacy, was a man of lower Churchmanship and weaker character, and his Primacy was marked by a relaxation of discipline and an increase of Puritanism. Whitgift (1583—1604), the next Archbishop, by his vigorous enforcement of discipline, rescued the Church for a time from the trammels of Puritanism. But the action of Pope Pius V., and the frequent conspiracies made by the Romanists against her life, so intimidated the Queen, that she was led to swamp the Church with Bishops holding the views of the Swiss Reformers, the staunch opponents of Rome; so that the Church, which was, at the commencement of her reign, a nest of Papists, was, at her death, a hot-bed of Puritanism. But Elizabeth was sound in doctrine; the Church in its Formularies had steered safely between Lutheranism and Calvinism on the one hand, and Romanism on the other. The reaction of Puritanism was accidental and temporary; so long as the Church retained its Prayer-Book and all Catholic doctrine, the reassertion of its discipline was a mere matter of time.

The Church had under the Tudors thrown off the supremacy of Rome, but under them it had also suffered much. Henry VIII., whilst asserting the ancient rights of the Crown, had put forth new claims, and used his power as supreme Head in the spoliation of Church property. Under Edward VI. it ran for a time the risk of having heretical doctrines enforced on it, which would have separated it from the unity of Christendom.

This risk prepared the way for the reaction under Mary, which was not altogether a loss to the Church. For the persecutions under her bigoted husband created a fresh hatred of Romanism, and turned its thoughts once more to its national independence. The subjection to Rome was finally, and for ever, thrown off under Elizabeth; after her time, the battle was with Non-conformity, between Catholicism and Protestantism, and the victory was assured to the former, because it is the religion of Christ, of His Apostles, and of the Church from the earliest and purest days of Christianity.

What the Reformation did for England was this.—It gave it an open Bible; services in a language which the people can understand; a Prayer-Book framed out of the ancient service-books of the Church; Communion in both the Body and Blood of Christ; and it allowed the Clergy to marry. All these points are agreeable to Catholic usage, as it existed in the time of the Apostles and of the Primitive Church. Whilst it brought back what was primitive and Apostolical, it was necessary to root out weeds, and to get rid of several customs which were mediæval and not Catholic. There was no act of Schism on the part of England; England simply repudiated Papal claims, not the Primacy of the Pope, and refused to recognise what Popes like Gregory the Great had repudiated. The act of separation was the work of the Pope.

The Church now takes its stand on, and is ready to be judged by, the earliest ages of the Church. In its Articles, in its Homilies, in its Canons, it appeals again and again to ancient Authors, ancient Canons, ancient Fathers and Decrees.

We will, before concluding, take a brief glance at the XXXIX. Articles.

Article XXII. condemns several *Romish* doctrines, such as Purgatory, Pardons, the worship of Images and Relics, and

Invocation of Saints, because they are not warranted by Scripture. Article XXVIII. rejects Transubstantiation, which was not made a doctrine of the Church till A.D. 1215^b. Article XXXI. condemns the Roman Sacrifices of Masses; not the Mass itself, by which the Holy Eucharist is termed in the First Prayer-Book of King Edward VI. Article XXIV. speaks of Public Prayer in a tongue not understood of the people as "repugnant to the Word of God and the custom of the primitive Church." Article XXX. prescribes Communion in Both Kinds, because it is agreeable to Christ's ordinance and commandment. Article XXXII. allows the Clergy to marry, because they are not commanded by God's Law to abstain from marriage.

And as the Church steers clear of Romanism on the one hand, so does it avoid Protestant and other errors on the other. Article XI. teaches that we are accounted righteous "only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our works or deservings;" but (Article XII.) Good Works do necessarily accompany Faith, which is known by them as a tree is known by its fruit. Article XIII. condemns the doctrine of the Schoolmen^c as to Works of Supererogation.

The Church is described (Article XIX.) as a visible congregation of faithful men where the Bible is preached and the Sacraments are duly administered according to Christ's ordinance. But (XXIII.) no one can take upon himself the office of ministering in the congregation, except those who are lawfully called and sent; and (XXXVI.) those who are Consecrated or Ordered according to the English Prayer-Book of King Edward VI. are such as are "rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered."

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation" (Article VI.), and nothing but what is contained therein or proved thereby is an article of the faith, necessary for salvation. The three Creeds (VIII.) must be thoroughly received and

^b See p. 457.

^c See p. 497.

believed, for they can be proved by most certain warrants of Scripture. And (XX.), "The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of Faith." Persons excommunicated by the Church (XXXIII.) are, until they are reconciled, to be regarded as Heathens; and whosoever wilfully breaks the traditions and ceremonies of the Church (XXXIV.) ought to be rebuked openly. Article XXXVII. asserts the independence of the Church of England, and the great principle for which the English Reformation was undertaken, "The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England."

And thus the matter stands in the present day. The Church of England refuses to recognise the Supremacy of Rome, for the reason that it is not primitive but mediæval, contrary to the intention of the Apostles, grounded upon the error that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, and fostered by two glaring impositions, the Clementine forgery and the Pseudo-Isidore Decretals. But it has nowhere pronounced against the Primacy, originally accorded to the local See of Rome, on the ground that Rome was the capital of the Roman Empire, by the Œcumenical Councils.

In many respects the English Reformation differed from that on the Continent. Luther at first revolted from Rome on account of the wicked lives of the Popes, and England did the same for the same reason. But there all resemblance ceases. Luther had no direct influence on the English Reformation, which would have taken place, and been of the same character, even if Luther had never lived. The English Prayer-Book and Articles are free from Lutheranism; for though the latter drew, and were framed, on the model of the Augsburg Confession, only what was Catholic was adopted, and all that was distinctly Lutheran rejected. Luther's doctrine of Consubstantiation is as alien, as is the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation; although the Church of England holds, as firmly as either, the

doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist. Lutheran Solifidianism has no place in the English Creed, which however inculcates, as strongly as Luther, the doctrine of Justification by Faith, but it is Faith showing itself in the believer's life.

Nor are our Articles Zwinglian, for they repudiate the doctrines of Zwingle. Nor are they Calvinistic, for there is no proof that Calvin's views are anywhere alluded to ; for Article XVII., on *Predestination*, does not refer to Calvin's doctrine, but to the teaching of the Schoolmen on what was called the *merit of congruity*.

Luther did a great work ; for what Popes would not, before his time, do, and what the Florentine Reformer, Savonarola, failed to do, that he succeeded in doing. The reform that he inaugurated in Germany compelled the Church of Rome to reform itself. Thus he was the real author of the Council of Trent, and the Jesuits were called into being by his Reformation.

He deserves credit as the champion of the Bible, which, as Reuchlin and Erasmus gave it to the educated, he gave to the poor. The Church of England holds to the Bible no less firmly than Luther did ; but it accepts the Bible as interpreted by the Church, whereas Luther accepted it as interpreted by himself. The immediate consequence was, that his followers claimed the same right of interpreting the Bible for themselves, and put upon it various constructions. If Luther claimed the right to interpret the Bible for himself, why should not Carlstadt, and Zwingle, and Calvin, and John Knox, do the same ? And what were the consequences ? It would be unjust to call Luther a Rationalist, yet Rationalism was the outcome of his teaching ; and ever since the time of Frederic II., King of Prussia, who was a follower of Voltaire, a spirit of unbelief has been widely prevalent in the Protestantism of Germany.

Carlstadt and his followers found socialistic views in the

Bible ; and antinomianism and crime were the result. Although Calvin never meant it, we cannot help thinking that Calvinism engendered Unitarianism. Servetus, who started from Calvinism, was followed by the two Socini, who began as orthodox Calvinists, but lapsed into the heresy, which Calvinists would repudiate, but which brought Servetus to the flames. The German and Swiss Reformers, whilst both alike claimed the Bible and the Bible only as their Rule, created a breach between themselves, which has existed ever since.

The result in Germany of Luther's Reformation is to be found in the Evangelical Prussian Establishment of the present day. The condition of that Church is described in a volume, published in 1867, entitled, "The Church, its Origin, its History, its present Position." A great gulf, it says, is fixed between the faith of the Protestant Church and the faith of the population. The (Roman Catholic) Bishop of Paderborn affirms, that he knows of Protestant towns of 18,000 inhabitants, where there are only some thirty-two or thirty-four Church-goers. But the writer instances Berlin, in which, with a population of 650,000, there was only Church accommodation for 40,000, and the Churches are seldom filled. Nor was the case different in Leipsic where he himself resided.

This was written before the wars with Austria and France, which first gave the leadership in Germany to Prussia, and then revived the German Empire ; with the result that Berlin, in December, 1880, numbered 1,122,360 inhabitants, without, however, any material increase in Church accommodation.

It need not be pointed out how different is the present state of the Church of England, where no breach with the Apostolical and Primitive Church was ever effected, nor even, except for a short time by a body of fanatics, contemplated. Germany set up a new Church ; England revived the old, and retained all that was Catholic in the mediæval Church. It takes its stand on the Bible, on the Two Sacraments, on the Three

Creeds, on the Six General Councils, on the doctrines which were taught by the Apostles in the First, and by the Church in the Second Century ; and has continued the Apostolical succession to the present day.

It would be a grievous blunder in any Statesman to lay sacrilegious hands on such a Church, or to cripple its means of doing good. There are three cases in which interference might be necessary ; such as unsoundness of doctrine, inefficiency of results, breach of continuity with the Catholic Church. The Church of England (and with it we combine the Church of Wales), cannot be accused of the first. The Church of Ireland was justly disendowed on the second ground, and was in reality an alien Church^d ; whereas it is admitted, by foes as well as friends, that the Church of England was never more efficient than in the present day. Nor can it be attacked on the third ground ; for English Churchmen can assert that the Archbishops of Canterbury, from Cranmer, and Pole, and Parker, down to Benson, equally derive their succession from St. Augustine (he, too, owing his consecration not to a Pope of Rome, but to the Gallican Church^e,) as do Theodore, and SS. Anselm and Becket, and Warham.

We refer again to Dr. Döllinger, who, being a learned Roman Catholic Theologian, is an impartial authority :—"No Church," he says, "is so national, so deeply rooted in popular affection, so bound up with the institutions of the country, or so powerful in its influence on national character. . . . What I should estimate most highly is the fact that" (the italics are our own), "*the cold, dull indifferentism which on the Continent has spread like a deadly mildew over all degrees of society* has no place in the British Isles." And may we not believe that the life and energy which characterise the Church in the present day, and the place it holds in the affections of the people, are due to its unbroken continuity with the Catholic Church?

^d See p. 620.

^e See p. 284.

And, if so, we may end, by way of encouragement, whatever temporal misfortunes may befall it, with the promise, for the future as in the past, of Christ's ever-abiding Presence, "Lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the world."

END.

INDEX.

- Abelard, 444, 445, 498.
 Abu-Bakr, 316.
 Acacians, 167.
 Acacius, Bishop of Cæsarea, 160, 168.
 ——— Patriarch of Constanti-
 nople, 249—252.
 Acephali, 250, 264.
 Acesius, 147, 149.
 Achilles, 145.
 Acholius, 190.
 Acœmetæ, 251.
 Acre, 483.
 Acts of the Apostles, 53.
 Adalbert, 413.
 Adelphius, 140.
 Adeodatus, 206, 208, 211, 216.
 Adhemar, 481.
 Adiaphoristic Controversy, 582.
 Adoptionism, 362.
 Adrianople, Battle of, 137.
 Ælia Capitolina, 100.
 Æneas, 20.
 Æons, 80.
 Ætius, heretic, 167.
 ——— General, 234, 235.
 Agabus, 22, 46.
 Agape, 87, 94.
 Agapetus I., Pope, 261.
 Agatho, Pope, 323 *sq.*
 Agilbert, 300, 301.
 Agrippa I., 24.
 ——— II., 49, 51, 52.
 Aidan, 297, 298.
 Aistulf, 353.
 Alaric, 208, 213—217.
 Alban, 132.
 Alberic, 387.
 ——— St., 442.
 Albert, Elector, 560.
 ——— the Great, 501.
 Albigenses, 505.
 Albinus, 54, 70.
 Alboin, 270.
 Alcfrith, 299.
 Alcuin, 355, 356, 366.
 Aleppo, 318.
 Alexander, the Coppersmith, 56, 79.
 ——— Severus, 119.
 ——— Bishop of Jerusalem, 121.
 ——— Patriarch of Alexandria,
 145, 146, 150.
 ——— Constantino-
 ple, 155.
 ——— II., Pope, 411, 412.
 ——— III., ——— 434, 448 *sq.*, 450.
 ——— IV., ——— 471.
 ——— VI., ——— 542.
 Alexandria, 23, 115, 319, 320.
 ——— School of, 75.
 Alleluia Victory, 240.
 Allen, 641, 643.
 Alliance, Holy, 569.
 Alterius Orbis Papa, 289.
 Alva, 587.
 Amasalunta, 259.
 Ambrose, 178, 187, 189, 190, 194 *sq.*,
 198.
 Ambrosian Chant, 198.
 Ambrosius Aurelianus, 241.
 America, Discovery of, 536.
 Amerigo Vespucci, 536.
 Ammianus, 183.
 Ammonius Saccas, 121.
 Ampulle, Sainte, 257.
 Anacletus, 69.
 Ananias, 17.
 ——— High Priest, 50.
 ——— and Sapphira, 9.
 Anastasia, Church of, 186.
 Anastasius, Presbyter, 222.
 ——— Patriarch of Constanti-
 nople, 340.
 ——— I., Emperor, 251, 252.

- Anastasius II., Pope, 252, 269.
 Anatolius, 230, 237.
 Andrew, 73.
 Angelo, Castle of St., 280.
 Angelos, Isaac, 484.
 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 307, 404.
 Anicetus, 104.
 Anna, 298.
 Annas, 54.
 Annates, 509, 534, 627.
 Anne of Bohemia, 524.
 Annianus, Bishop of Alexandria,
 260, 261, 263.
 Anomœans, 167.
 Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury,
 427, 431, 496, 497.
 — of Lucca. See Alex-
 ander II.
 Anthimus, Patriarch of Constanti-
 nople, 260, 261, 263.
 Antioch in Syria, 23, 25, 41, 114,
 116, 318, 320.
 — in Pisidia, 27.
 Antipas, 2, 18, 24.
 Antoine de Bourbon, 583, 585, 587.
 Antonina, 263.
 Antoninus Pius, 101, 102.
 — Proconsul, 114.
 Aphthardocetæ, 267, 269.
 Apocrypha, 609.
 Apollonius, Senator, 114.
 — heretic, 191.
 Apollonian heresy, 191.
 Apollos, 42, 65.
 Apologies, 98, 101, 102, 103, 117.
 Apology for the Confession, 577.
 Apostles' Creed, 86, 326.
 Apostolical Canons, 325 *sq.*
 — Constitutions, 325 *sq.*
 — Fathers, 104.
 Appeal, Act of Restraint of, 627.
 Aquila, 38, 41.
 Aquinas, 497, 501.
 Arabia, 18, 311, 314, 315.
 Arcadius, 197, 202.
 Arch, Constantine's, 136.
 Archelaus, 2, 3.
 Archipelago, Monks of the, 334.
 Archippus, 56.
 Architecture, Church, 490.
 Areopagus, the, 37.
 Aretas, 18.
 Arianism, 143, 145, 167, 201, 216,
 253, 258, 267, 270, 271.
 Arimathæa, Joseph of, 5.
 Aristarchus, 46, 52.
 Aristides, 98.
 Aristotle, 498, 539.
 Arius, 145, 147, 148, 151, 162, 198.
 Arles, Church of, 107.
 — Councils of, 127, 140, 165.
 Armenians, 269.
 Arnold of Brescia, 439, 445 *sq.*
 Arnulf, 373.
 — St., 350.
 Arsacius, 202.
 Arsenius, 154.
 Artemas, 56.
 Arthur, King, 241.
 Articles, Ten, 629.
 — Six, 631, 634.
 — Forty-two, 635.
 — Thirty-nine, 641, 645.
 — not Zwinglian,
 648.
 — not Calvinistic,
 648.
 Arundel, 525.
 Asaph, 245.
 Ascidas, 264.
 Assertio Septem Sacramentorum, 565.
 Athalaric, 259, 261.
 Athanasian Creed, 329.
 Athanasius, 147, 150—175, 177, 179.
 — Monophysite, 249.
 Athaulf, 217, 218.
 Athenais. See Eudocia.
 Athens, 37, 184.
 Attalus, 109.
 — mock Emperor, 214.
 Atticus, Proconsul, 94.
 — Patriarch of Constantinople,
 203.
 Attila, 233 *sq.*
 Augsburg, Diet of, 576.
 — Confession, 576.
 — Interim, 582.
 — Religious Peace of, 583.
 Augustine, Archbishop of Canter-
 bury, 280—291.
 — Bishop of Hippo, 179,
 203, 205—209, 220.

- Augustine's Oak, 287.
 Aurelian, 129.
 Ausculda Fili, Bull, 475.
 Ausonius, 189.
 Austrasia, 258.
 Austria, 461.
 Auxentius, 165, 174, 187.
 Ave Maria, the, 497.
 Avignon, Popes at, 508, 512, 516,
 517.

 Babylas, 121.
 Babylon, 64.
 Babylonish Captivity, the, 508.
 Bacon, Roger, 502.
 Bale, 621.
 Bangor, 244.
 — Iscoed, 287.
 Baptism, Institution of, 1.
 — Clinical, 125.
 — by heretics, 126.
 Barbarossa. See Frederic I.
 Barcochebas, 99.
 Bardas, 378, 379, 382.
 Bari, Council of, 427.
 Barlow, 639.
 Barnabas, 9, 14, 19, 23, 25 *sq.*, 28,
 30, 32, 74.
 — Epistle of, 74.
 Baronius, 604.
 Bartholomew, 73.
 Bartholomew's Day, Massacre of,
 588.
 Basil of Cæsarea, 170.
 — the Great, 179, 183—185, 193.
 — the Macedonian, 382.
 Basilica, 490.
 Basiliscus, 248.
 Basle, Council of, 532 *sq.*
 Beaton, 597.
 Beaufort, 522.
 Bec, 421.
 Becket, 432, 435, 449.
 Bède, 306, 405.
 Beder, 315.
 Beghards, 496.
 Beguines, 496.
 Belisarius, 261, 262, 263, 269.
 Benedict (of Nursia), 271, 272, 281,
 368.
 Benedict Biscop, 299, 301, 302,
 306, 307.
 — (of Aniane), 368.
 — VII., Pope, 390, 391.
 — IX., — 394, 395.
 — XI., — 476.
 — XII., — 511.
 — XIII., — 518, 527, 528,
 530.
 Beræa, 36.
 Beringar, 397, 421, 422.
 — II., King, 397.
 Bernard, 367, 370.
 — St., 437, 439, 442, 444,
 446, 482, 497.
 Bernardino Ochino, 603.
 Bernice, 51.
 Bertha, 282.
 Bessarion, 540.
 Bethany, 4.
 Bethlehem, 2.
 Beza, 596.
 Bible, Tyndale's, 629.
 — Coverdale's, 630.
 — Matthew's, 630.
 — Cranmer's, 631.
 — Wicliffe's, 523.
 — translated into French, 583.
 Biblis, 109.
 Birinus, 296.
 Black Death, 512.
 Blandina, 109.
 Blesilla, 204.
 Bobbio, 275, 392.
 Boccaccio, 537.
 Boethius, 254, 255, 405.
 Bogoris, 383.
 Boleyn, Ann, 626, 627.
 Bologna, Council of Trent transferred
 to, 610.
 Bonaventura, 502.
 Boniface, see Winfrid.
 — III., Pope, 309.
 — IV., — 309.
 — VI., — 385.
 — VII., — 390, 391.
 — VIII., — 465—476, 508.
 — of Savoy, 469.
 — of Montferrat, 484, 485.
 Bonivard, 592.
 Bora, Catharine von, 572.

- Borromeo, Carlo, 610.
 Bothwell, 599.
 Bouchier, 534, 536.
 Bozra, 317.
 Bradwardine, 512.
 Breakspear, see Hadrian IV.
 Breviary, revision of the, 615, 634.
 Brightwald, 307.
 Britain, 57.
 — Church of, 110, 219—222, 239, 240, 244, 274, 305, 401 *sq.*
 — Conquest of, 242, 244.
 Brothers of the Common Life, 544.
 Brown, 620.
 Brunehild, 350.
 Bruno, see Leo IX.
 — St., 441.
 Bryce's, St., Day, 407.
 Bucer, 595, 596, 633.
 Bucolas, 104.
 Bulgaria, 383, 384.
 Bullinger, 578, 594, 596.
 Bulls, 303.
 Burgundians, 189.

 Caaba, 311, 316.
 Cabot, Sebastian, 535.
 Cadolus, 411.
 Cadwallon, 294, 295.
 Cæcilian, Bishop of Carthage, 139, 140.
 Caen, 421.
 Caerleon, 245.
 Cæsar Borgia, 542.
 Cajetan, 563.
 Calais, loss of, 637.
 Caligula, 24.
 Calixtines, 531.
 Calixtus II., Pope, 426, 431.
 Calne, Council of, 406.
 Calvin, 584, 592—596.
 Calvinism, five points of, 594.
 — errors of, 596.
 — favourable to Unitarianism, 650.
 Camaldolites, 440.
 Cambray, Peace of, 570.
 Campeggio, 626.
 Campion, 642.
 Candace, 14.

 Candidian, 225.
 Canossa, 416.
 Canterbury, 284, 285, 287, 421, 427.
 Canute, 394, 407.
 Capitularies, 366.
 Cappel, Battle of, 592.
 Capuchins, 603.
 Caracalla, 118.
 Caraffa, 579, 602, 603, 606. See Paul IV.
 Cardinals, 411.
 — determine to reform the Church, 528.
 Carlo Borromeo, 74.
 Carloman, 352.
 Carovingians, 258, 354.
 Carlstadt, 559, 564, 566, 573.
 — Antinomianism caused by, 648, 650.
 Carmelites, 443, 492, 494.
 Caroline Books, 356.
 Carpus, 57.
 Carthage taken by the Saracens, 319.
 Carthusians, 441.
 Cassian, 179.
 Cataphrygians, 109.
 Catechism, Luther's Greater, 575.
 — Little, 575.
 — Cranmer's, 634.
 — Church, 635.
 Cathari, 127, 505.
 Catharine of Siena, 517.
 Catholic League, the, 589.
 Caxton, 535.
 Cedd, 299 *sq.*
 Cedron, 4.
 Celestine, heretic, 219, 220.
 — I., Pope, 221, 222, 226.
 — V., — 464.
 Celestines, 496.
 Celidonius, 228.
 Celtic Language, 243, 245.
 — Missions, 278, 304.
 Cencius, 412.
 Century X., Character of, 386.
 Cerinthus, 80, 81.
 Cerularius, 398, 399.
 Chad, 299, 301, 302.
 Chalcedon, Council of, 231 *sq.*, 247 *sq.*

- Chalons, 234.
 Chantries, destruction of, 634.
 Charlemagne, 269, 354, 355, 360 *sq.*,
 365, 367.
 Charles the Bald, 370, 405.
 ——— Bold, 587.
 ——— Fat, 373.
 ——— Simple, 405.
 ——— IV., Emperor, 512, 515.
 ——— V., ——— 554, 555, 563,
 569.
 ——— VII., King of France, 533.
 ——— IX., ——— 586,
 588, 589.
 Chichely, 528, 532, 534.
 Chichester, See of, 303.
 Childeric, 256.
 Chilperic, King of Burgundy, 257.
 ——— the Franks, 353.
 Chosroes I., 260.
 ——— II., 310.
 Christian Era, the, 2, 268.
 Christian Nobles throughout Ger-
 many, Luther's address to, 564.
 Christianos ad leones, 90.
 Christians, persecutions of. See Per-
 secutions.
 ——— why persecuted, 91, 93.
Χριστοτύκος, 222.
 Chrysostom, 179, 192, 199—202.
 ——— Prayer of St., 199.
 Church, foundation of the, 1.
 ——— the Orders of, 83.
 ——— and State, 158.
 ——— property of the, 159.
 Circumcelliones, 141.
 Cistercians, 441, 442.
 Clair-Vaux, Monastery of, 442.
 Clarendon, Constitutions of, 434.
 Claudius, 24, 38, 49.
 Clemens Alexandrinus, 121, 122.
 Clement of Rome, 57, 69, 104, 117.
 ——— III., Antipope. See Guibert.
 ——— IV., Pope, 461.
 ——— V., ——— 476, 508 *sq.*
 ——— VI., ——— 511, 514, 515, 519.
 ——— VII., ——— 517, 569, 570, 572,
 578.
 Clementine Forgery, 69.
 Clementines, the, 511.
 Clericis Laicos, Bull, 473, 474.
 Clermont, Council, 423, 480.
 Clotilda, 257.
 Cloveshoo, 340.
 Clovis, 256—259.
 Clugniacs, 440.
 Code, the, 268.
 Colet, 543 *sq.*
 Coligny, 584.
 Colman, 300 *sq.*
 Colossæ, 65.
 Colosseum, 97.
 Colossians, Epistle to, 52.
 Columba, 297.
 Columban, 274, 275, 338.
 Columbus, 535.
 Commentaries, Calvin's, 593.
 Commodus, 113.
 Common Order, Book of, 599.
 Communion in One or Both Kinds,
 610, 613, 616, 631, 632, 634, 636,
 645.
 Conception of the Blessed Virgin
 Mary, 497.
 Concordat, 630, 639.
 Condé, Dukes of, 586, 602.
 Confessio Tetrapolitana, 577.
 Confirmation, 80.
 Confutation, 577.
 Congal, 274.
 Congregation, Lords of, 598.
 Congruity, merit of, 648.
 Conrad I., 373.
 ——— II., 394.
 ——— III., 439, 447.
 Conradin, 461.
 Constance, Council of, 529.
 Constans I., 135, 160, 163, 164.
 ——— II., 322, 323.
 Constantia, 136, 151.
 Constantina, 292.
 Constantine the Great, 133—141,
 146—159, 359, 367.
 ——— Donation of, 358.
 ——— II., 135, 136, 155,
 160.
 ——— Pogonatus, 323.
 ——— Copronymus, 340.
 ——— Porphyrogenitus, 343.
 ——— Patriarch of Constanti-
 nople, 341, 343.
 ——— Pope, 326, 332.

- Constantinople, foundation of, 152, 153.
 ————— rank given to Bishop of, 193, 238.
 ————— Patriarch of, styled Œcumenical, 276.
 ————— rivalry between and
 * Rome. See under Rome.
 ————— 1st Council of, 191, 193.
 ————— 2nd ————— 265.
 ————— 3rd ————— 323.
 ————— Iconoclastic Council of, 341.
 ————— besieged by Saracens, 320.
 ————— pillaged by Crusaders, 484.
 ————— Latin Kingdom and Patriarchate of, 485.
 ————— recovered by Greeks, 486.
 ————— taken by Turks, 536.
 Constantius, 160, 161, 163, 165, 166, 168, 169.
 Consubstantiation, 573, 647.
 Contarini, 580, 602.
 Convocation, 467, 472, 473, 624, 625, 627, 629, 631, 634, 640.
 Copts, 269.
 Corinth, 38, 44, 65.
 Corinthians, St. Paul's 1st Epistle to, 43.
 ————— 2nd ————— 43.
 Cornelius, 21, 22.
 ————— Bishop of Rome, 125, 126.
 Cosmas, 342, 343.
 Coverdale, 630, 639.
 Cranmer, 347, 627, 631, 633, 637.
 Crescens, 84, 107.
 ————— Cynic, 103.
 Crete, 44.
 Crispus, 40.
 Cromer, 620.
 Crusades, 481—487.
 ————— the Children's, 486.
 ————— effect of, 489.
 Culdees, 297.
 Cuthbert, St., 298 *sq.*
 ————— Archbishop of Canterbury, 338, 340.
 Cynegils, 297.
 Cyprian, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128.
 Cyriacus, 292, 309.
 Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, 202, 222—226.
 Cyrus, 321, 322.
 D'Ailly, 526, 529.
 D'Albret, Jeanne, 583, 588.
 Damaris, 38.
 Damascene, John, 341 *sq.*, 346, 354.
 Damascus, 16 *sq.*, 317.
 Damasus I. (Pope), 182, 183, 191, 204.
 ————— II., ——— 396.
 Damiani, 410.
 Damietta, 487.
 Dandolo, 484, 485.
 Danes, see Northmen.
 Daniel, Bishop of Winchester, 337.
 ————— Pillar-Saint, 182.
 Darnley, 599.
 Dated Creed, 168.
 David, 245.
 Deaconesses, 85.
 Deacons, the Seven, 10.
 Decius, 120, 121, 128.
 Decretals of Dionysius Exiguus, 269.
 ————— Isidore, 357.
 ————— Pseudo-Isidore, 70, 357
 ————— 360, 374, 376, 377, 380.
 Decretum of Gratian, 500.
 Dedicated Creed, 161.
 Defender of the Faith, 565.
 De Heretico Comburendo, Statute, 526, 634.
 Deiniel Wyn, 245.
 Demas, 67.
 Demetrius, 44.
 Demiurge, the, 79.
 Demophilus, Arian Patriarch of Constantinople, 174, 187.
 Deo Gratias, 237.
 Desiderius, 354.
 Deusdedit, 301.
 Dictate, the, 419.
 Didius Julianus, 114.
 Diet, the German, 555.
 Dinooth, 287.
 Diocletian, 129, 130, 132, 133.
 Dionysius the Areopagite, 38, 84, 108.

- Dionysius Exiguus, 268, 357.
 Dioscorus, 226, 229.
 Diptychs, the, 251.
 Discipline, Book of, 598, 600.
 Docetæ, 81.
 Döllinger, Dr., 640, 650.
 Dominic, 493.
 Dominicans, 492, 494, 495, 497, 521.
 Domitian, 76, 78.
 Domnus, 226, 228, 300.
 Donation of Constantine, 358.
 Donatists, 139, 140, 141, 190, 208, 236.
 Dorchester, 297.
 Douay, Seminary of, 642.
 Dowdall, 621.
 Drusilla, 49.
 Dublin, Trinity College, 622.
 Dubricius, 245.
 Dulia, 497.
 Dunstan, 406.
 Dunwich, 295.
 Durandus, 509.

 Eadbald, 292, 293.
 Eanfleda, 293, 294.
 Eanfrid, 295.
 Earconbert, 301.
 Earthquake Council, 523.
 Easter, observance of, 105, 112, 140, 148, 300.
 Easterfield, 307.
 Eastern Empire, extinction of, 536.
 Eata, 299, 300.
 Ebionites, 100.
 Eborius, 140.
 Eck, 564, 566, 574, 576, 580.
 Ecthesis, 321, 467, 469.
 Edgar, 405.
 Edinburg, 293.
 Edmund, St., King, 403.
 ——— Rich, Archbishop of Canterbury, 469.
 Edward, Martyr, 406.
 ——— Confessor, 408.
 ——— I., 472, 473, 488.
 ——— II., 518.
 ——— III., 519.
 ——— VI., 633, 635.
 ——— First Prayer-Book of, 634, 639.
 Edward VI., Second Prayer-Book of, 635, 639.
 ——— Schools of, 624.
 Edwin, 293, 294.
 Egbert, King of Kent, 301.
 ——— Archbishop of York, 355.
 ——— King of Wessex, 402.
 Egfrith, 302.
 Egmont, 587.
 Egypt, 318.
 Eidgenossen, 584.
 Elagabalus, 118.
 Eldest Sons of the Church, 258.
 Eleutherius, 110.
 Elflæda, 298.
 Elfric, 423.
 Elipand, 363.
 Elizabeth, of England, 612, 614, 635
 —638, 641, 643.
 ——— of Spain, 587.
 Ella, 279, 293.
 Elphege, 407.
 Emesa, 517.
 Endowments, Church, 305.
 England, independence of Church of, 465, 466, 472, 519, 520, 525, 532, 536.
 ——— Papal extortions in, 467—
 471, 473, 474, 510, 518, 519, 534, 535.
 English, the, 241—243, 278, 406.
 ——— Conversion of the, 278—
 304.
 Eorpwald, 295.
 Epaphroditus, 84.
 Ephesians, St. Paul's Epistle to the, 52.
 ——— Epistle of St. Ignatius to, 96.
 Ephesus, 41, 43, 44, 45, 56, 65.
 ——— Council of, 222, 225, 226.
 Epicureans, 37.
 Epistolæ obscurorum virorum, 557.
 Erasmus, 545—549, 556, 648.
 Erastus, 44, 56.
 Erigena, John Scotus, 347, 497.
 Ermenburga, 370.
 Essenes, 176.
 'Etrapeiui, 91.
 Ethelard, 407.
 Ethelbert, 282 sq., 289.

Ethelburga, 293, 294.
 Ethelnoth, 407.
 Ethelwulf, 403.
 Eucharist, Institution of, 1.
 Eudocia, 217.
 Eudoxia, 201, 202.
 ——— 217, 218, 236.
 Eudoxius, 174.
 Eugenius II., Pope, 371.
 ——— III. ——— 442, 446.
 ——— IV. ——— 532, 533, 538.
 Eunice, 33.
 Eunomians, 167.
 Eusebia, 170.
 Eusebians, 167.
 Eusebius of Nicomedia, 146, 147,
 148, 151, 156.
 ——— Cæsarea, 146, 147, 148,
 154, 160.
 ——— Vercelli, 165, 179.
 ——— Dorylæum, 228.
 Euphemius, Patriarch of Constanti-
 nople, 249, 251.
 Eustathius, 154.
 Eustochium, 204, 205.
 Eutyches, 228.
 Eutychius, Patriarch of Constanti-
 nople, 275, 278.
 Evagrius, 174.
 Evangelists, 85.
 Evaric, 262.
 Evodius, 63.
 Exaltation of the Holy Cross, 311.
 Exarchs, 262.
 Exivi de Paradiso, Bull, 496.
 Exsurge Domine, ——— 565.
 Extravagantes, 511.
 Fabian, Pope, 121.
 Fagius, 633.
 Farel, 592.
 Farrar, 636.
 Fastidius, 220.
 Fatima, 312.
 Fausta, 135, 136, 150.
 Favritta, Patriarch of Constantinople,
 249, 251.
 Felicitas, 112, 116.
 Felix, 49—51.
 ——— of Aptunga, 165.
 ——— Antipope, 165.

Felix III., Pope, 248, 250, 255.
 ——— IV., ——— 255.
 ——— V., ——— 533.
 ——— Bishop of Dunwich, 295.
 ——— Urgel, 363.
 Ferdinand of Aragon, 554.
 ——— Emperor, 574, 581, 614.
 Ferrara, Council of, 533.
 Festus, 51, 52, 54.
 Fèvre, Pierre de, 606, 607.
 Field of the Cloth of Gold, 568.
 Finan, 299.
 Firmilian, 127.
 First Fruits, 474, 534.
 Fisher, 546, 548, 628.
 Flavian, 226, 228 *sq.*
 Florence, the New Learning in, 537 *sq.*
 ——— Council of, 533.
 Fontaines, 274.
 Fontenoy, 372.
 Formosus, Pope, 377, 378, 385.
 Fortunatus, 125.
 France, 373.
 ——— the Reformation in, 583—
 590.
 Francis of Assisi, 493.
 ——— I., 534, 555, 568, 569, 578,
 581, 584.
 ——— II., 586.
 Franciscans, 492, 494, 497, 521.
 Frankfort, 257.
 ——— Synod of, 356, 363.
 Franks, 218, 256, 258, 352.
 Fratricelli, 496.
 Fredegund, 350.
 Frederic I. (Barbarossa), Emperor,
 447—451, 482.
 ——— II., Emperor. 452, 453,
 457, 458, 460, 486, 487.
 ——— the Wise, 559, 563, 573.
 Friesland, 303.
 Fulk, King of Jerusalem, 482.
 ——— Priest of Neuilly, 483.
 Fursey, 295.
 Gabriel, 312, 313.
 Gaetani. See Boniface VIII.
 Gaetano, 603.
 Gaius, 40.
 Galatia, 42.
 Galatians, Ep. to, 45.

- Galerius, 131, 133, 135.
 Gall, 275.
 Gallienus, 128, 129, 188.
 Gallinaria, 180.
 Gallio, 39.
 Gallus, 128.
 Gamaliel, 10, 19.
 Gardiner, 630, 636.
 Gaul, 320.
 — Church of, 107, 221, 256, 259
 — and the Popes, 474.
 Gaunt, John of, 522.
 Gebhard, 400.
 Geilana, 275.
 Gelasius I., Pope, 59.
 — II. — 430.
 Geneva, General Assembly, 598.
 — Order of, 598.
 Genseric, 209, 235, 236.
 George of Cappadocia, 161, 163.
 Gerbert. See Sylvester II.
 German, 181, 221, 239.
 Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 334.
 ————— 489.
 Germany, 354, 373.
 — Missions in, 336, 340, 351.
 — desire in for the Reformation, 554, 556.
 Gerson, 526, 527, 529.
 Gessius Florus, 70.
 Geta, 118.
 Gethsemane, 4.
 Ghibellines, 453.
 Gildas, 245.
 Glasgow, See of, 296.
 Gloriosam Ecclesiam, Bull, 496.
 Gnosticism, 79.
 Godfrey de Bouillon, 481, 482.
 Golden Bull, 516, 555.
 Goodacre, 621.
 Gordian, 120.
 Gospels, the Four, 82.
 Gothic Architecture, 490, 491.
 Goths, 188, 201, 211, 215, 262, 267.
 Gottshalk, 348, 349.
 Gozbert, 275.
 Grandimontanes, 441.
 Gratian, 359, 500.
 — Emperor, 185, 189, 194.
 — See Gregory VI.
 Greek language, 117.
 ————— ignorance of, 500,
 543.
 ————— revival of, 517, 538.
 Gregorian Chant, the, 198, 281.
 Gregory Thaumaturgus, 123.
 — of Cappadocia, 161, 163.
 — Nazianzen, 170, 179, 183—
 187, 191, 192, 193.
 — the Great, Pope, 179, 198,
 244, 271, 273—282, 289—292, 331.
 — of Nyssa, 183, 185.
 — of Tours, 259.
 — II., Pope, 334—336, 337,
 352.
 — III. — 336—339, 352.
 — IV. — 371.
 — V. — 391.
 — VI. — 395.
 — VII. — 412, 414 *sq.*, 420,
 421, 444, 478.
 — IX. — 506.
 — X. — 462.
 — XII. — 518, 530.
 — XIII. — 642.
 Grey, Lady Jane, 633, 635, 636.
 Grindal, 644.
 Grocyn, 543, 545.
 Grosseteste, 467, 470.
 Gualbert, 440.
 Guelphs, 453.
 Guibert, 411, 417, 418.
 Guiscard, 418.
 Guise, Elder Duke of, 584—587.
 — his son, 589.
 Gutenberg, 535.
 Guthrum, 404.
 Hadrian, Emperor, 98, 99.
 — monk, 301, 306.
 — I., Pope, 344, 359, 420.
 — II. — 375, 376.
 — IV. — 446, 447, 448,
 471.
 — VI. — 545, 569, 571, 572.
 Hadrianople, 188.
 Hales, 502.
 Hallam, 528, 529.
 Hamilton, 596.
 Hanno, 413.
 Harold, 409.

Hastings, 409.
 Hatfield, 305.
 Heathfield, 294.
 Heavenfield, 295.
 Helena, 149, 310.
 Heliopolis, 317.
 Heloise, 444.
 Helvetic Confession, First, 579.
 Hengist, 241, 242.
 Henoticon, 249, 250.
 Henry, the Fowler, Emperor. 373.
 ——— II., Emperor, 293, 294.
 ——— III. ——— 395, 396, 409.
 ——— IV. ——— 409, 412,
 415, 424.
 ——— V. ——— 424 *sq.*
 ——— VI. ——— 451.
 ——— VII. ——— 510.
 ——— I., of England, 428, 455.
 ——— II. ——— 433, 434, 435,
 436.
 ——— III. ——— 458, 466, 469,
 472.
 ——— VIII. ——— 625.
 ——— II., of France, 585.
 ——— III. ——— 589.
 ——— IV. ——— 584, 588, 589.
 Heptarchy, 279, 282, 289, 402.
 Heraclas, 122.
 Heraclius, 310, 311, 316, 319, 322.
 Herluin, 421.
 Hermogenes, 56.
 Hermon, 582.
 Herod, the Great, 2.
 Herodias, 18, 125.
 Hertford, Council of, 304.
 Hesse, Landgrave of, 573, 577.
 Hexapla, 123.
 Hilary, of Arles, 181, 227, 329.
 ——— of Poitiers, 165, 168, 169,
 174, 180.
 ——— Pope, 229, 230, 238, 248.
 Hilda, 293, 298, 300.
 Hildebrand, 395, 396, 410, 411.
 See Gregory VII.
 Hincmar, of Rheims, 258, 347, 349,
 359, 374 *sq.*
 ——— of Laon, 376.
 Hindostan, 321.
 Hippo, 208, 227.
 Hispaniola, 535.

Hodgkins, 639.
 Hohenstaufens, 439, 461.
 Holy Roman Empire, 362, 363.
 Homilies, First Book of, 634.
 ——— Second ——— 641.
 Homoiousians, 169.
 Homoousion, the, 147, 167, 169.
 Honoratus, 228.
 Honoria, 218, 235.
 Honorius I., Emperor, 197, 202, 211,
 213 *sq.*
 ——— I., Pope, 294, 297, 321,
 324 *sq.*
 ——— II., ——— 411.
 ——— III., ——— 457, 466, 468.
 ——— Archbishop of Canterbury,
 294.
 Hooper, 633, 636.
 Hormisdas, Pope, 255, 262.
 Horn, 587.
 Horsa, 292.
 Hosius, 146, 151, 162, 165.
 Hubert, 454.
 Humanism, 538, 543.
 Humbert, 398, 399.
 Huns, the, 233.
 Huss, 525, 530.
 Hussite War, 531.
 Hutton, 557.
 Hymenæus, 79.
 Hypatia, 223, 224.
 Hyperdulia, 497.
 Ibas, 264, 265.
 Iconoclastic Controversy, 331 *sq.*
 Ignatius, St., 83, 95, 96 *sq.*, 104.
 ——— Patriarch of Constanti-
 nople, 378, 379, 380, 383.
 Iltutus, 245.
 Immaculate Conception, 496.
 India, 321, 607.
 Indulgences, 497, 509, 560.
 Ineffabilis Deus, Bull, 474, 496.
 Infallibility, Papal, 325.
 Injunctum Vobis, Bull, 606.
 Innocent I., Pope, 58, 202, 227.
 ——— II., ——— 439.
 ——— III., ——— 452—457, 483.
 ——— IV., ——— 459, 460, 469.
 ——— VI., ——— 515.
 ——— VIII., ——— 542.

- Inquisition, the, 493, 606; 636.
 Institutes, 268.
 Institutio Christianæ Religionis, 593.
 Invention of the Holy Cross, 150.
 Investiture, 414, 415, 425, 427—432.
 Iona, 297.
 Isabella of Castile, 554.
 Isaurian Dynasty, the, 332.
 Isidore of Seville, 358.
 Isidorus Mercator, 358.
 Jacob Baradæus, 250, 269.
 Jacobites, 250, 269, 318.
 James, brother of St. John, martyr-
 dom of, 29.
 ——— Bishop of Jerusalem, 20, 46,
 47, 53, 63, 69.
 ——— Epistle
 of, 53.
 ——— Litur-
 gy of, 87.
 ——— the Deacon, 294.
 ——— I., of England, 584, 599, 600.
 Jarrow, 307, 402.
 Jason, 35.
 Jerome of Prague, 525, 530.
 ——— St., 179, 198, 203—205.
 Jerusalem, Church of, 1, 7, 8, 16, 23,
 24, 30, 46, 53, 72, 379.
 ——— Council of, 30.
 ——— Second Council of, 73.
 ——— Patriarchate of, 232, 320.
 ——— destroyed by Titus, 70—72.
 ——— Hadrian,
 100.
 ——— rebuilding of Temple of,
 171.
 ——— taken by Persians, 310.
 ——— Mahometans, 317,
 318, 478.
 ——— recovered by Crusaders,
 481.
 ——— Latin Kingdom of, 482.
 ——— taken by Saladin, 482.
 ——— Tartars, 487.
 Jesuits, 273, 496, 602, 605, 606, 607,
 620, 642.
 Jesus Christ, Life of, 1—6.
 Joanna, 554.
 John, Apostle, 8, 13, 63, 76, 78, 79,
 81.
 John, Apostle, Epistles of, 81.
 ——— Gospel of, 81.
 ——— Revelation of, 77.
 ——— St., Ante Portam Lati-
 nam, 77.
 ——— Baptist, 3, 18, 42.
 ——— of Beverley, 308.
 ——— de Brienne, 486.
 ——— the Faster, 275, 290, 291.
 ——— the Stedfast, 573, 574, 578.
 ——— King of England, 454—457.
 ——— Patriarch of Antioch, 225, 226.
 ——— Constantinople,
 252.
 ——— Iconoclastic Patriarch of Con-
 stantinople, 346.
 ——— I., Pope, 253, 254.
 ——— III., ——— 266.
 ——— IV., ——— 322, 324.
 ——— VI., ——— 326.
 ——— VIII., ——— 384.
 ——— IX., ——— 385.
 ——— X., ——— 387.
 ——— XI., ——— 387.
 ——— XII., ——— 387—389.
 ——— XIII., ——— 390.
 ——— XIV., ——— 390.
 ——— XV., ——— 391.
 ——— XXII., ——— 496, 510, 511.
 ——— XXIII., ——— 528, 529, 530.
 ——— XVI., ——— Antipope, 391.
 ——— Frederic, 578.
 Josephus, 51, 72.
 Jovian, 173.
 Jubilee, 475.
 Judaism, 20.
 Judas Iscariot, 4, 6.
 Jude, 74.
 ——— Epistle of, 74.
 ——— Grandsons of, 77.
 Judith, 370.
 Julian, Apostate, 160, 164, 169—172,
 180, 184.
 ——— of Halicarnassus, 269.
 Julius I., Pope, 161, 162, 164.
 ——— II., ——— 541, 542, 546, 559.
 Justification by Faith, Luther's doc-
 trine of, 559, 561, 580, 602, 609.
 Justin Martyr, 66, 101—104.
 ——— I., Emperor, 252, 253, 259.
 ——— II., ——— 269.

Justinian I., Emperor, 252, 259—
 268; 490.
 — II., ———— 326.
 Justus, 286, 289, 293, 294.
 Jutes, 242.
 Katharine of Aragon, 625, 627.
 Kemp, 534.
 Kentigern, 296.
 Khadijah, 311.
 Kilian, 275.
 Kirk, the Scottish, 600.
 Kitchen, 639.
 Knights, Hospitaller, 443.
 — Templar, 443, 509.
 — Teutonic, 443.
 Knox, 596—600.
 Koran, 312, 313.
 Koreish, the, 311, 313.
 Labarum, 139, 173.
 Lactantius, 136, 213.
 Lanfranc, 421 *sq.*
 Langham, 521.
 Langton, 454, 455, 456, 457, 466,
 467.
 Lapsed, the, 124, 125.
 Lastingham, 301.
 Lateran Basilica, 136.
 — Councils, 323, 426, 432, 439,
 450, 456, 553, 602.
 Latin Fathers, 198, 203, 205, 280.
 — language, 117.
 Latria, 497.
 Latrocinium, 229, 230.
 Lauras, 178.
 Laurence, martyr, 128.
 — Archbishop of Canterbury,
 283, 292, 293.
 — Antipope, 252.
 Laynez, 613.
 Learning, the New, 360, 538, 548,
 549, 623, 624.
 Legates, 490.
 Legnano, battle of, 450.
 Leipsic, Interim, 582.
 Leo I., Pope, 324.
 — II., — 329.
 — III., — 360.
 — V., — 387.
 — VIII., — 390.

Leo IX. Pope, 397, 400.
 — X. — 534, 537, 543, 550,
 557, 563, 568.
 — I., Emperor, 247, 248.
 — III., the Isaurian, 332, 333.
 — IV., Chazarus, 343.
 — V., The Armenian, 345.
 — VI., 384.
 Leonidas, 115.
 Lerins, 181.
 Lewes, battle of, 472.
 Lewis IV., Emperor, 510, 512.
 Libanius, 184, 198, 199.
 Libellatici, 124.
 Liberius, Pope, 164, 165, 166, 182.
 Libertines, 11.
 Lichfield, 299, 302.
 Licinius, 136, 137.
 Licitæ Religiones, 91.
 Linacre, 543, 545.
 Lindisfarne, 297, 402, 404.
 Litany, 280.
 Llandewi-Brefi, 246.
 Llanwit-Major, 245.
 Loci Communes, 567.
 Lois, 33.
 Lollardy, 523, 525.
 Lombard, Peter, 500.
 Lombards, the, 270, 271, 352, 354.
 London, See of, 286, 288.
 Lord's Prayer, the, 86.
 Lorraine, 373.
 — Cardinal of, 589, 613.
 Lothaire I., 369, 370, 371, 372.
 — II., 375.
 Louis, the Pious, 367, 368, 369, 370,
 372.
 — German, 370, 372, 373.
 — IX. (St.), 458, 459, 487, 488.
 — XI., 534.
 Loyola, 605—607.
 Lucifer, 165.
 Lucius, King of Britain, 110.
 — I., Bishop of Rome, 126.
 — II., Pope, 446.
 — III., — 451.
 — Patriarch of Alexandria, 182.
 Lucus Victorix, 246.
 Lügenfeld, 372.
 Luidhard, 282.
 Luitbrand, 352.

- Luke, 33, 45, 52, 62, 67, 75.
 — Gospel of, 75.
 — Acts of the Apostles, 75.
 Lull, 339.
 Lupus, 181, 221, 240.
 Luther, 573, 575, 576, 579, 581, 647,
 648, 649.
 Luxueil, 274.
 Lydia, 33.
 Lyons, Church of, 108.
 — 1st Council of, 459.
 — 2nd ——— 462.
 Lysias, 48, 50.

 Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem,
 149.
 ——— Patriarch of Antioch, 324.
 Macedonia, 33, 44, 45.
 Macedonian heresy, 191.
 Macedonius, Patriarch of Constanti-
 nople, 160.
 ——— heretic, 191.
 Macrianus, 128.
 Macrinus, 118.
 Magdeburg Centuriators, 360.
 Magna Charta, 456, 457.
 Magnentius, 164.
 Magnesians, Epistle of St. Ignatius
 to, 96.
 Mahomet, 311—316.
 Mammæa, 119.
 Mandates, 471.
 Manfred, 461.
 Manichæans, 144, 206, 208, 253.
 Marburg, Conference at, 575.
 Marcella, 179.
 Marcia, 113.
 Marcian, 231, 236.
 Marcus Aurelius, 113.
 Marguerite of Valois, 583, 584.
 Marignano, battle of, 568.
 Marinus, 140.
 Mark, 25, 26, 27, 32, 64, 65, 75.
 — Gospel of, 75.
 Marozia, 386.
 Marriage, Clerical, 327, 406, 410,
 411, 412, 414, 415, 430, 439, 467,
 610, 613, 615, 631, 634, 636, 645.
 Martel, Charles, 320, 327, 351,
 352.

 Martin of Tours, 179, 180.
 ——— I., Pope, 323.
 ——— IV., ——— 464.
 ——— V., ——— 530, 532.
 Martyrs, fortitude of the, 130.
 Mary, the Virgin, 75, 609.
 — of Lorraine, 584, 598.
 — Queen of Scots, 584, 586, 589,
 598, 637, 642.
 ——— England, 626, 635,
 636, 637, 643.
 Matthew, 74.
 ——— Gospel of, 74, 75.
 Matthias, 6, 74.
 Maurice, Emperor, 276, 279, 280,
 290, 291.
 ——— Elector, 582.
 Maxentius, 133, 136.
 Maximian, Patriarch of Constan-
 tinople, 226.
 ——— Emperor, 130, 132, 133,
 135.
 Maximin, Bishop of Treves, 155.
 ——— the Thracian, 119.
 ——— Emperor, 132, 133, 136.
 Maximus, Patriarch of Constan-
 tinople, 191.
 ——— Emperor, 194, 195.
 ——— Usurper, 235, 236.
 ——— Writer, 322, 323.
 Mayors of the Palace, 336, 350, 353.
 Mecca, 311, 316.
 Medici, Cosmo de', 530, 537, 538.
 ——— Lorenzo — 537, 539, 540.
 ——— Catharine — 584, 588, 599.
 Melanchthon, 562, 567, 575, 576,
 582, 583, 631.
 Melchiades, Bishop of Rome, 140.
 Melchites, 250, 319.
 Meletians, 144, 166.
 Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, 191,
 192, 199.
 ——— of Lycopolis, 144,
 148.
 Mellitus, 286, 288, 292, 293.
 Melrose, 300.
 Memnas, 261, 265.
 Memnon, 225.
 Menander, 80.
 Mendicants, the, 492, 498, 520, 523.
 Menevia, 246.

- Mensurius, 139.
 Merovingians, 352.
 Methodius, 346.
 Metropolitans, 84.
 Michael de l'Hopital, 586.
 — the Drunkard, 346, 378, 382.
 Milan, Church of, 74, 198.
 — Council of, 162.
 — Edict of, 136.
 Miletus, 45.
 Military Orders, the, 443.
 Miltitz, 563.
 Milvian Bridge, 135.
 Minervina, 135.
 Minucius Felix, 99.
 Missal, revision of the, 615, 634.
 Monarchians, 142.
 Monasteries, destruction of in Ire-
 land, 621.
 ————— Eng-
 land, 628, 629.
 Monasticism, 176, 177, 179, 184, 272,
 306, 355, 406, 439, 492.
 Monica, 206, 208.
 Monks of East and West, 272.
 Monophysites, 228, 247.
 Monothelites, 321.
 Montanists, 111.
 Montanus, 111, 115.
 Monte Casino, 273.
 Montfort, Simon de, 471, 472.
 Moravian Brethren, the, 532.
 More, 545, 546, 626, 628.
 Morie Encomium, 547, 557.
 Morosini, 485.
 Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury,
 534.
 Moslem, 313.
 Mountjoy, 545, 546.
 Muhlberg, 581.
 Mungo, 246.
 Münster, Anabaptists of, 567.
 — Bishop of, 582.
 Mursa, 164.
 Naassenes, 81.
 Nag's Head Fable, 639.
 Nantes, Edict of, 590.
 Narses, 262, 269, 270.
 Nathaniel, 73.
 Nazarenes, 100.
 Nazarite, 47, 177.
 Necessary Doctrine and Erudition,
 632.
 Nectarius, 192, 200, 202.
 Neoplatonism, 121, 260, 348.
 Neri, Philip of, 604.
 Nero, 51, 54, 67, 71.
 Nerva, 78.
 Nestorians, 247, 250.
 Nestorius, 203, 222, 224, 225, 226,
 228.
 Netherlands, War in the, 587.
 Nestria, 258.
 Nice, 1st Council of, 112, 146—149,
 193, 227.
 — 2nd ——— 344, 346, 356.
 Nicene Creed, 147, 151, 193, 198.
 Nicetas, 342.
 Nicolaitans, 11, 81, 415, 420.
 Nicolas I., Pope, 359, 374, 375,
 379, 381.
 — II., — 422.
 — III., — 464.
 — IV., — 464.
 — V., — 536, 537, 538.
 Nicomedia, 131.
 Nidd, 307.
 Ninian, 181, 296.
 Noetus, 142.
 Nogent, 257.
 Nominalists, 499, 502.
 Nonna, 185.
 Norbert, 442.
 Norman Conquest, 408, 429, 430, 433.
 — — Architecture, 490, 491.
 Northmen, 400, 402 *sq.*, 408.
 Northumberland, Duke of, 633, 635.
 Noting, 349.
 Novatian, 125, 126.
 Novatians, 127.
 Novatus, 124, 125, 126.
 Nuremberg, Diet of, 571.
 — Religious Peace of, 578.
 Oak, Council at the, 202.
 Ockham, William of, 502.
 Odo, 406.
 Odoacer, 237, 238.
 Ecolampadius, 573, 575, 578.
 Ecumenical Bishop, 276, 290, 292,
 398.

- Offa, 420.
 Ohud, 315.
 Oil, anointing with, 88.
 Olives, Mount of, 4.
 Omar, 318, 319.
 Onesimus, 56.
 On the Babylonish Captivity, Luther, 565.
 ——— Freedom of the Christian, Luther, 565.
 Ophitæ, 81.
 Oratorio, the, 604.
 Oratory of Divine Love, 602.
 ——— Priests of the, 604.
 Orders in the Ministry, 83, 85.
 Orestes, 223.
 Origen, 116, 120—124, 266, 267, 279.
 Osfrid, 294.
 Osiander, 575, 633.
 Oskytel, 406.
 Osney, 467.
 Osric, 295.
 Ostrogoths, 188, 189, 262.
 Oswald, 295, 297, 298.
 Oswin, 298.
 Oswy, 295, 297, 298.
 Otto I., the Great, 373, 388.
 — II., 390.
 — III., 390—393.
 Oxford, 348, 404.
 Pachomius, 179.
 Pagan, meaning of, 188.
 Palæologi, the, 486.
 Palæologus, John, 516, 533.
 ——— Michael, 461.
 Palladius, Patriarch of Antioch, 249.
 ——— Irish Missionary, 296.
 Pandects, 268.
 Pandulf, 455.
 Pantænus, 73, 122.
 Pantheon, 309.
 Papacy, during the Middle Ages, 337, 353, 357, 359, 362, 366, 369, 419, 438, 442, 452, 458, 476, 480, 490, 507, 516, 551, 600.
 Papias, 84, 104.
 Parker, 639, 644.
 Parliament, English, 467, 472.
 ——— the Reformation, 626.
 Paschal I., Pope, 369, 370.
 Paschal II., Pope, 423, 424, 425, 482.
 Passau, treaty of, 582.
 Patmos 77, 81.
 Patriarchs, 84.
 Patricius, 206.
 Patrick, 296.
 Patripassians, 142.
 Paul his First Missionary Journey, 26—28.
 ——— Second ———
 32—41.
 ——— Third ———
 41—46.
 ——— before the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem, 49.
 ——— Felix, 50.
 ——— Agrippa II. and Festus, 51.
 ——— appeals to Cæsar, 51.
 ——— his journey to Rome, 52.
 ——— his first imprisonment at Rome, 53, 54.
 ——— Where did he go from Rome? 55—59.
 ——— his second imprisonment at Rome, 62, 67.
 ——— his martyrdom, 68.
 ——— of Samosata, 143.
 ——— Monothelite Patriarch of Constantinople, 160, 161, 163.
 ——— Patriarch of Constantinople, 322, 323, 344.
 ——— II., Pope, 541.
 ——— III., — 578, 608.
 ——— excommunicates Henry VIII., 628.
 ——— IV., — 611, 637, 638, 640.
 Paula, 204, 205.
 Paulicians, 363, 364, 505.
 Paulines, the, 603.
 Paulinus, 286, 293, 294.
 Paulus, Sergius, 26.
 Pavia, Lombard capital, 270.
 ——— battle of, 569.
 Peada, 298.
 Peasants' War, 570.
 Pelagians, 208, 219, 220.
 Pelagius, 219, 220.
 ——— I., Pope, 262, 266, 275.
 ——— II., — 275, 288.
 Pella, 71, 100.
 Penda, 294, 298.

- Pentecost, Day of, 6, 7.
 Perpetua, 112, 115.
 Persecutions, the ten :—
 I., under Nero, 54, 57, 68.
 II. — Domitian, 76.
 III. — Trajan, 93.
 IV. — Marcus Aurelius, 102.
 V. — Septimius Severus, 115.
 VI. — Maximin, 120.
 VII. — Decius, 121.
 VIII. — Valerian, 128.
 IX. — Aurelian, 129.
 X. — Diocletian, 131—136.
 Persia, 310, 311, 316, 317.
 Persons, 642.
 Pertinax, 114.
 Peter, 7, 8, 9, 13, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24,
 25, 31, 59, 65, 68, 69, 70.
 — was he Bishop of Rome? 59—63.
 — First Epistle of, 56, 64.
 — ——— written from
 Babylon, 64.
 — Second Epistle of, 68.
 — of Murrone. See Celestine V.
 — Bishop of Alexandria, 144, 145,
 182. 
 — Mongus, 248.
 — Fuller, 249.
 — Martyr, 633.
 — the hermit, 474, 475, 481.
 Peter-pence, 420.
 Peter's, St., at Rome, 560.
 Petrarch, 537.
 Petrobussians, 505.
 Pfefferkorn, 556.
 Pharisees, 10, 12.
 Philadelphians, Epistle of St. Ignatius to, 96.
 Philemon, Epistle to, 52, 56.
 Philetus, 79.
 Philip the Apostle, 73.
 — Evangelist, 14.
 — I. of France, 423.
 — Augustus, 453, 458, 482.
 — the Fair, 474, 475, 509.
 — II. of Spain, 585, 587, 598,
 636, 642, 643.
 — Landgrave, 573.
 — the Arabian, 112.
 Philippi, 33.
 Philippians, Epistle to, 52, 83.
 Philippicus, 330.
 Phocas, 291, 292, 309, 310.
 Phoebe, 44.
 Photius, 163, 379, 381—384.
 Phrygians, 110.
 Phygelus, 56.
 Piacenza, Council of, 479.
 Picts, 241.
 Piers Ploughman, 521.
 Pipin, of Heristhal, 336, 350.
 — the Little, 353.
 — son of Charlemagne, 367.
 Pisa, Council of, 528.
 Pistus, 161.
 Pius II., Pope, 534, 536, 540.
 — IV. — 611, 640.
 — ——— Creed of, 615.
 — V., excommunicates Queen
 Elizabeth, 641.
 Placidia, 217, 218.
 Platina, 541.
 Platonic Academy, 538.
 Platonism, 498, 538.
 Pliny the Younger, 93.
 Pneumatomachi, the, 191.
 Poitiers, battle of, 515.
 — ——— Synod of, 423.
 Pole, 579, 602, 609, 636, 637.
 Polycarp, 84, 96, 104—106.
 Polycrates, 112.
 Ponticus, 109.
 Pontius Pilate, 5.
 Poor Men of Lyons. See Waldenses.
 Pope Joan, 374.
 Popes as Vicars of Christ, 386.
 — election of, 410, 450.
 — temporal power of, 353.
 Pothinus, 84, 108.
 Poynet, 635.
 Præmunire, Statutes of, 519, 525, 532,
 626.
 Pragmatic Sanction, 459, 534.
 Praxeas, 142.
 Predestination, controversy on, 348.
 — ——— Calvin's doctrine of,
 594, 648.
 Premonstratensians, 442.
 Presbyters, 23, 28.
 Primacy, the Pope's, 647.
 Primer, 632.

- Printing, invention of, 335, 538, 600.
 Prisca, 130.
 Priscilla, 38, 41.
 Priscillianists, 194.
 Procurators, 2, 49, 70.
 Prophets, 85.
 Proselytes of the Gate, 30.
 — Righteousness, 29.
 Proterius, 248.
 Protestant, meaning of, 595.
 Protestants, or Lutherans, 609, 611, 612, 615, 617, 631.
 Provisions, 471, 519.
 Provisors, Statutes of, 519, 525.
 Prussian Establishment, 651.
 Pseudo-Clementines, 69, 105, 113, 126, 127, 154.
 — Isidore Decretals. See Decretals.
 Pulcheria, 216, 217, 231, 237.
 Puritans, 127, 643 *sq.*
 Puteoli, 52.
 Pyrrhus, 322.

 Quadratus, 98.
 Quadrivium, 500, 545.
 Quæstors, 561.
 Quarto-Decimans, 105, 288.
 Quercy, 349.
 Quicunque Vult Hymn, 181.
 Quinsext Council, 325, 326.

 Rabanus Maurus, 347.
 Radbert, 346, 347.
 Radbod, 337, 351.
 Rationalism, 648.
 Ratisbon, Diet of, 580.
 — Interim of, 580.
 Ratramn, 347.
 Ravenna, 213.
 Realists, 499, 502.
 Redwald, 289.
 Reformation, causes which led to it, 550.
 — Different Character of in different Countries, 551.
 — What it did for England, 645.
 — How the English differed from that of other countries, 647.

 Reformation, The English, uninfluenced by Luther, 647.
 — No breach made in England with the Primitive Church, 649.
 Regimini Militantis Ecclesiæ, Bull, 606.
 Regnans in Excelsis, — 641.
 Religionis Zelus, — 603.
 Remigius, 257, 259.
 Renaissance, the, 539, 546, 550, 584.
 Representations in Churches, 331.
 Repton, 299.
 Republic, Roman, 445, 447, 512.
 Reservations, 509.
 Restitutus, 140.
 Reuchlin, 556, 557, 562, 648.
 Revocatus, 116.
 Reynolds, 518.
 Rheims, Jesuit Seminary at, 642.
 Riccardi, 271.
 Richard Cœur de Lion, 482, 483.
 Rricula, 288.
 Ridley, 637.
 Rienzi, 512—515.
 Rimini, Council of, 168, 182, 195.
 Rizzio, 599.
 Robert, Duke of Normandy, 405.
 — of Jumièges, 408.
 — St., 441.
 Rochester, See of, 289.
 Roderic, 320.
 Rodriguez, 607.
 Rogers, 637.
 Rollo, 405.
 Romance language, 243.
 Romanesque Architecture, 470.
 Romans, St. Paul's Epistle to the, 44, 60.
 — Epistle of St. Ignatius to the, 96.
 Romanus, 293, 294.
 Rome, sacked by Alaric, 213—216.
 — Genseric, 235.
 — Guiscard, 418.
 — Charles V., 570.
 — Church of, 53, 66, 113, 154, 193, 238, 334, 337.
 — temporal power of, 353, 354.
 — advantage from in Middle Ages, 338, 420.

- Rome, rivalry between and Constanti-
nople, 153, 193, 227, 228, 230,
233, 238, 250, 251, 252, 309, 322,
337, 349, 352, 361, 362, 364, 375,
381, 382, 383, 399.
— relations between the Popes of
and the Emperors, 364, 366, 367,
369, 371, 374, 378, 382, 395, 396,
398, 411, 412, 415, 416, 417, 431,
432, 448, 450, 452, 459, 460, 461,
465, 510.
— Seminary at, 394.
Romuald, 440.
Roses, Wars of the, 473, 535, 622.
Rubric, the black, 639.
Rudolph, Duke of Suabia, 417.
— of Hapsburg, 461.
Rum or Run, 294.
- Sabellius, 142.
Sabert, 288.
Sabinianus, 309.
Sacraments, number of the, 609, 629.
Sacrificati, 124.
Sadducees, 8, 9, 12.
Sadoletti, 602.
Saladin, 482, 483.
— Tax, the, 489.
Salophaciolus, 248.
Samaritans, 13.
Sampson, 541.
— St., 245.
Sanctus, 109.
Sapor, 128.
Saracens, 313, 317—321, 351.
Sarangossa, 194.
Sardica, Council of, 162, 227, 358.
Sarum Breviary, revision of, 631.
Sasima, 186.
Saul, 10—19, 23, 25, 26.
Savonarola, 539, 543, 648.
Schism, the Great in the Roman
Church, 517, 522, 526, 530.
— between East and West, 399.
Schmalcald, Diet of, 509.
Schmalcaldic League, 577, 579.
— War, 581.
— League, destruction of,
582.
Scholastica, 273.
Scholasticism, 442, 497 *sq.*, 500, 503,
543.
- Schoolmen, the, 497.
Scinde, 320.
Scory, 639.
Scotland, Pope's Claim on, 473.
Scots, 241.
Scotus, Duns, 501.
Secundulus, 116.
Seleucia, 168.
Selsey, 303.
Semi-Arians, 167, 168.
Seminarists, 642, 643.
Semi-Pelagians, 180.
Sentences, Book of, 500.
Septimius Severus, 115, 118.
Septuagint, 205.
Serenus Granianus, 98.
Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople,
321, 322, 324.
— III., Pope, 387.
— Paulus, 26.
Servetus, 595, 649.
Severa, 120.
Severus, Emperor, 133.
— Bishop, 221.
— Patriarch of Antioch,
269.
Sewall, 471.
Sicilian Vespers, 464.
Sicisinus, Basilica of, 183.
Sigebert, 295, 299.
Sigismund, 529, 530.
Simeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, 73, 94.
Simon the Zealot, 74.
— Magus, 13, 14, 16, 65, 66,
79.
Simplician, 207.
Simplicitas, Pope, 248, 250.
Siricius, Pope, 205, 269, 357.
Sirmium, Council of, 163.
— 1st Creed of, 163.
— 2nd ——— 165.
— 3rd ——— 168.
Sisinnius, Patriarch of Constantinople,
203.
— Pope, 326.
Sixtus II., Pope, 128.
— IV. ——— 541.
Slave-boys, British in Rome, 279.
Smyrnæans, Epistle of St. Ignatius
to, 96.
Socini, the, 649.
Somascentes, 604.

- Somerset, Duke of, 633.
 Sophia, Church of, 268.
 ——— Wife of Justin II., 270.
 Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem,
 318, 321—324.
 Sosthenes, 39, 40.
 Spain, 57, 320, 554.
 Spalatin, 563.
 Spearhafoc, 408.
 Spires, Diet of, 512.
 ——— two Diets of, 581.
 ——— Diet of, 581.
 Stephanas, 40.
 Stephen, St., 441.
 ——— the Deacon, 11, 12.
 ——— I., Pope, 126, 127, 128.
 ——— II., ——— 341, 353.
 ——— IV., ——— 369.
 ——— V., ——— 378.
 ——— VI., ——— 385.
 Stigand, 408, 421.
 Stilicho, 213, 235.
 Stoics, the, 37, 103.
 Stylites, the, 181.
 Subiaco, 273.
 Suidgar. See Demasus II.
 Sully, Duke of, 590.
 Συνεστακοί, 200.
 Supererogation, Works of, 427.
 Supremacy, Papal, 337, 338, 624,
 625, 627, 632, 636, 647.
 ——— Royal, 624, 627, 628,
 632, 638.
 Sweating Sickness, the, 576.
 Sweyne, 407.
 Swithin, 403.
 Syagrius, 257.
 Sylvester, Pope, 262, 263.
 Sylvester I., Pope, 146, 359.
 ——— II., ——— 390, 391, 392, 393,
 478.
 ——— III., ——— 394, 395.
 Symmachus, ——— 252, 255.
 Tabitha (Dorcas), 20.
 Tarausius, 344.
 Thadioc, 24.
 Theatines, 603, 606.
 Theban Legion, 130.
 Theobald, 433.
 Theodelinda, 171.
 Theodora, wife of Justinian, 260,
 263, 264.
 Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury,
 301 *sq.*, 324, 325.
 ——— I., Pope, 223.
 ——— of Mopsuestia, 264, 266.
 Theodoret, 225, 264, 265.
 Theodoric, 239, 252, 253, 254, 259.
 Theodosius, Bishop of Jerusalem,
 248.
 ——— Archbishop of Ephesus,
 341.
 ——— I., Emperor, 190, 191, 195,
 196, 197.
 ——— II., ——— 216, 217, 226,
 230, 231.
 Theodotus, 261.
 Theognis, 148, 151.
 Theology, the Sum of, 501.
 Theon, 244.
 Theopaschites, 249.
 Theophano, 390.
 Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria,
 200, 201, 202.
 ——— Gothic Bishop, 147.
 ——— Emperor, 346.
 Therapeutæ, 176.
 Theses, Luther's, 561, 563.
 Thessalonians, 1st and 2nd Epistle
 to, 40.
 Thessalonica, 35.
 Thomas, Apostle, 74.
 Three Chapters, 264, 265.
 Thundering Legion, 106.
 Thurificati, 124.
 Timothy, St., 33, 36, 39, 41, 44, 56,
 57.
 ——— 1st Epistle to, 56.
 ——— 2nd ——— 62.
 ——— Celurus, 248.
 ——— Patriarch of Constantinople,
 252.
 Tithes, 159, 306.
 Titus, St., 29, 33, 44, 55.
 ——— Epistle to, 56.
 ——— Emperor, 71, 72, 76.
 Tolbiac, 257.
 Toledo, Synod of, 271.
 Toleration of Christians, 129, 136,
 138.

- Toleration of Lutherans, 582.
 Tome, the, 229, 231, 248.
 Torgau, League of, 573.
 Totila, 262, 263.
 Tours, battle of, 351.
 ——— School — 356.
 Tradition, 609.
 Traditors, 132, 139.
 Trajan, 93, 94, 95, 99.
 Transubstantiation, 457, 503, 505,
 523, 616, 647.
 Treasury of Grace, 497.
 Trent, Council of, 581, 602, 608—
 615, 641.
 ——— not a General
 Council, 617, 618.
 ——— Index of, 615.
 ——— Catechism of, 615.
 ——— Articles declared
 by, 616.
 Trisagion, the, 249.
 Tristan, 488.
 Trivium, the, 500, 545.
 Troas, 31, 45.
 Trophimus, 46, 48, 56, 107.
 Troyes, Council of, 221.
 Trullians, Epistle of St. Ignatius to,
 96.
 Trullo, Council in, 325.
 Tryphon, 101.
 Tuda, 301.
 Turkish Sultan, 478.
 Tychichus, 56.
 Tyndale, 629.
 Type of Faith, the, 322.
 Tyrannus, 43.
 Tyre, 46.
 ——— Synod of, 161.
 Ufford, 512.
 Ulf, 408.
 Ulfilas, 188, 189.
 Ultramontaniam, 532.
 Unam Sanctam, Bull, 475, 602.
 Unction, 86.
 Unitarians, 142, 649.
 Upper Room, the, 6, 8.
 Urban II., Pope, 423, 425, 479, 480.
 ——— III., ——— 451.
 ——— IV., ——— 460.
 ——— V., ——— 516, 520.
 Urban VI., Pope, 517.
 Ursacius, 183.
 Ursula, 128.
 Ursulines, 604.
 Utraquists, 531.
 Ussher, 622.
 Valens, Arian Bishop, 163, 164, 165,
 168, 188, 189.
 ——— Emperor, 173, 174, 188, 189.
 Valentinian I., 173, 187.
 ——— II., 189, 194, 195, 197.
 ——— III., 218, 235.
 Valentinus, 113.
 Valeria, 130.
 Valerian, 128, 129.
 Valerius, 208.
 Vallombrosa, Monks of, 440.
 Vandals, 189, 236, 267.
 Vasco da Gama, 536.
 Vatican Library, 538.
 Venice, 46.
 Vergerio, 579, 580.
 Vespasian, 70, 71, 76.
 Victor I., Pope, 112, 113.
 ——— III., ——— 408.
 ——— IV., Antipope, 448, 449.
 Victorinus, 207.
 Vienne, Church of, 108.
 ——— Council of, 504.
 Vigilus, Pope, 261, 263, 264, 265,
 266.
 Vincent of Lerins, 181.
 Viret, 592.
 Visigoths, 188, 189, 213.
 Vitiges, 262.
 Völkerwanderung, the, 210 *sq.*
 Vortigern, 241.
 Vulgar Era, the, 268.
 Vulgate, the, 205, 539, 549, 609,
 638.
 ——— revisions of, 615, 616.
 Waldenses, 506.
 Waldo, 506.
 Wales, Church in, 244, 245, 246,
 277, 286, 287, 288.
 Walter, the Pennitess, 481.
 Warham, 546, 627.
 Wearmouth, 307, 402.
 Wedmore, 404.

- Welsh, the, 243.
 Westminster Abbey, 245, 408.
 Whitby, 300, 403.
 White House, the, 245.
 Whitgift, 644.
 Whithern, 296.
 Wicliffe, 521—525, 530.
 Wighard, 301.
 Wilfrid, 299—308.
 William, the Conqueror, 408, 409,
 411, 420, 430.
 Willibald, 339.
 Willibrord, 336, 337, 339.
 Winchelsea, 473.
 Winfrid, 337—340, 353.
 Wingfield, 248.
 Wini, 362.
 Wishart, 597.
 Witenagemot, 303, 305.
 Wittenberg, University of, 559.
 — Concord of, 579.
 Wolfgang, 393.
 Wolsey, 568, 626.
 Worms, Concordat of, 431.
 — Diet of, 566, 572.
 — Edict of, 566.
 Wykeham, William of, 521.
 Xavier, Francis, 606, 607, 608.
 York, See of, 286.
 — Minster, 293.
 Zacchæus, 84.
 Zachariah, Patriarch of Constanti-
 nople, 310, 340.
 Zaccharias, 352, 353.
 Zara, 484.
 Zealots, 74.
 Zeno, 238, 248, 249, 252.
 Zenobia, 143.
 Ziska, 531.
 Zosimus, Pope, 220, 227.
 Zwingle, 573, 575, 578, 590—592.

04334

270D

Hore, Rev. A. H.

H781

History of the

cop. 2

270D

H781

cop. 2

64339

